

357

RASHI'S COMMENTARY TO THE PENTATEUCH  
AND ITS RELATION TO THE TARGUMIM  
WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO TARGUM ONKELOS

by

PINCHAS TOLEDANO

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, LONDON

LONDON

1980

VOL 2

INTRODUCTIONThe Anti-Anthropomorphisms of  
Onkelos and Rashi's Attitude

Scholars have noted that one of the themes in the Targumim, especially that of Onkelos, is to avoid or paraphrase many of the terms which appear to attribute human qualities and emotions to God in the Hebrew Bible. The tendency of Onkelos is to remove an action connected with God which might lower his dignity or degrade his character. It is not our concern to go deeply into the origins of the objections to anthropomorphisms; that is whether they were the result of Philonic teachings and Greek philosophical influence in general or, rather, whether they grew up within Judaism itself.<sup>1</sup> The essential fact is that Onkelos is dominated - one might say obsessed - by anti-anthropomorphism and his aversion to attributing human form, passions and emotions to God, is quite apparent in his Targum. *There are, however, exceptions which will be considered below.* At this stage, before illustrating with examples some of the anti-anthropomorphisms of Onkelos' Targum, and Rashi's attitude towards them, which is our main subject, it may be worth mentioning briefly that the Torah<sup>2</sup> itself contains some anti-anthropomorphic assertions and implicit indications. Thus we read in (EX.20<sup>4-6</sup>) in the second commandment the prohibition of making graven images which is one indication that God cannot be compared to any material or corporeal form. The fact, too, that "No man could see me (God)

INTRODUCTION

and live" (EX.33<sup>20</sup>) - shows the anti-anthropomorphic insistence of the Torah.<sup>3</sup>

In more specific terms in DEUT.4<sup>15</sup> - we read that Moses said to the Israelites that "On the day when the Lord spoke to you out of the fire on Horeb, you saw no figure of any kind".(cf. DEUT.4<sup>12</sup>). Moreover certain expressions of the Torah such as - 'כבוד ה' - "the glory of the Lord" (EX.16<sup>10</sup>) or - 'ושכון כבוד ה' - "And the glory of God abode upon Mount Sinai",<sup>4</sup> or - 'כ' שם ה' - "And all the people on earth shall see that the Lord has named you as his very own", etc,<sup>5</sup> or - 'נץ ה' - "The cloud of the Lord" (EX.40<sup>28</sup>) manifest the anti-anthropomorphic tendency of the Torah. The writer was careful to say that it was only the glory of God that abode on Mount Sinai, and not God himself, as this might be considered a degradation and disrespect to the Deity. The fact, too, that the presence of the intermediary - "the angel of the Lord" is called upon quite frequently in the Torah points to the fact "that God was considered to be a transcendent being who revealed himself through other means than direct theophanies".<sup>6</sup> In other words what Eichrodt<sup>7</sup> calls - "die Vergeistigung der Theophanie" - the Spiritualization of the Theophany by means of such intermediaries as the angel of the Lord."<sup>8</sup>

INTRODUCTION

However the most paradoxical thing is that while some parts of the Old Testament explicitly repudiate anthropomorphic ideas about God, there is generally a quite uninhibited resort to anthropomorphic language. Thus the Torah says that God speaks (EX.16<sup>11</sup>; EX.11<sup>1</sup>) breathes (EX.15<sup>8</sup>) sees (GEN.6<sup>5</sup>) hears (DEUT.1<sup>34</sup>) walks (DEUT.1<sup>30</sup>; GEN.3<sup>8</sup>) and goes down (EX.19<sup>20</sup>). In some places God is even described as if he has a human form and thus the Torah speaks of - עֵינֵי ה' - "eyes of the Lord" (DEUT.11<sup>12</sup>) - יְמִין ה' - the right hand of the Lord EX.13<sup>3</sup>; EX.33<sup>22</sup>; DEUT.4<sup>34</sup>; DEUT.5<sup>15</sup>; DEUT.7<sup>19</sup>; DEUT.26<sup>8</sup>. This anomaly is apparent, too, in the prophetic books and the prophets who, on the one hand insist on the holiness<sup>9</sup> of God and his Divine transcendence<sup>10</sup>, while on the other hand they use the most unrestricted anthropomorphic language.<sup>11</sup>

Finally, the Sopherim in their massoretic list were careful in avoiding or changing conceptions which denote some apparently flagrant anthropomorphisms or which appear to lower the dignity of God or degrade his honour. But it may be noted that many others are passed over in silence. There are eighteen emendations<sup>12</sup> of the Sopherim which are termed "Tikune Sopherim".<sup>13</sup> It is not our subject here to enumerate and discuss the Tikune Sopherim,



INTRODUCTION

but for our purposes it may be useful to give two examples of how the Sopherim changed the wording of the Torah when they saw that the text as it stood was unbecoming to the Deity.

The first one is:- GEN.18<sup>22</sup> - וַאֲבְרָהָם עוֹדֵנוּ עֹמֵד לִפְנֵי ה' -

"But Abraham remained standing before the Lord".

According to massoretic tradition the original

reading was:- וְה' עוֹדֵנוּ עֹמֵד לִפְנֵי אֲבְרָהָם -

"But the Lord remained standing before Abraham".<sup>14</sup>

"To stand before" another sometimes denotes a state of servitude<sup>15</sup> and therefore the Sopherim altered the text so that God would not appear as if He were paying homage to Abraham.

The other case is:- NUM.11<sup>15</sup> - וְאַל אֵלֶּיךָ אֵלֶּיךָ בְּרָעָתִי -

"And let me, (i.e. Moses) not see my evil case".

Here the original reading was as follows:-

- וְאַל אֵלֶּיךָ בְּרָעָתִי -

"And let me not see your evil case"<sup>16</sup> (i.e. God's).

This reading apparently associates evil with God and therefore the Sopherim modified the text from

- בְּרָעָתִי - "your evil case" to - בְּרָעָתִי - "my evil case".<sup>17</sup>

INTRODUCTION

Having said all this let us now proceed to consider the Targum of Onkelos, and his attitude to anthropomorphisms found in the Old Testament. Onkelos is known throughout his translation of the Torah for being anti-anthropomorphic. Maimonides<sup>18</sup> and other scholars praised Onkelos for adopting this method. In many places he has added a word or even a whole phrase in order to remove any anthropomorphic conception from the Deity. Thus in GEN.11<sup>5</sup> - 'וַיֵּרָא ה' - "And the Lord came down to see the city etc". Onkelos who objects to the literal sense of - וַיֵּרָא - translates - וַיִּתְגַּלּוּ - "And the Lord revealed<sup>19</sup> himself". Quite often, as said above, Onkelos avoids or moderates conceptions of human qualities and emotions attributed to God in the Hebrew text, and therefore periphrases like - מִן קִדְּשׁוֹ ה' - "From before the Lord"<sup>20</sup> or the intrusion of - מִימְרֵהוּ - the Word<sup>21</sup> of the Lord, or - קִרְא דְּהוּא - "the Glory of the Lord",<sup>22</sup> or the "Angel of the Lord",<sup>23</sup> or the "Shechinah"<sup>24</sup> are quite common in his translation.

There are, however, several inconsistencies in Onkelos (in fact in all the Targumim) and in several places he has retained the most unrestricted anthropomorphic language. Thus while in EX.8<sup>15</sup> - אֶצְבַּע מִלֵּהוּ - Onkelos translates - אֶצְבַּע מִלֵּהוּ - "The finger of

INTRODUCTION

the Lord" - by - מִמֶּנּוּ מִן קֶדֶשׁ ה' - "A blow from before the Lord" - in EX.31<sup>18</sup> and DEUT.9<sup>10</sup> - כְּתוּבִים - "Written with the finger of the Lord" - Onkelos translates it literally<sup>25</sup> - כְּתִיבִין - מְנִי - Also whilst in GEN.46<sup>4</sup> - בְּאֶצְבָּע דָּה' - "I will go down with you to Egypt". Onkelos is not careful and translates - מְנִי אַחוּת עִמָּךְ מִצְרִימָה - אֶרֶץ - literally - אֶרֶץ - In GEN.11<sup>5</sup> ..... וַיֵּרֶד ה' לִרְאוֹת אֶת הָעִיר - "And the Lord came down to see the city"<sup>26</sup> - Onkelos is anti-anthropomorphic and translates - וְאַתְגַּלִּי - "revealed".

Again in some instances Onkelos attempts to avoid the more naive expressions in the Torah that make God to appear as a man with human form. Thus in EX.6<sup>8</sup> (cf. NUM.14<sup>30</sup>) - the Hebrew text reads:-

אֶל הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי אֶת יְדִי -  
 "I will lead you to the land which I swore with up-  
 lifted hand to give to Abraham".

Onkelos paraphrases<sup>27</sup> the text and translates -

- וְאֶעֱלֶיךָ יִתְּבוֹן לְאֶרֶץ דִּי קִיַּמְתָּ בְּמִמְרִי לְמַתָּן יְתֵדָה -  
 "And I will bring you unto the land concerning which  
 I did promise by my word to give to Abraham."<sup>28</sup>

However, here too, there are inconsistencies for in EX.13<sup>3</sup> - where the text speaks of ה' - "the hand of the Lord"<sup>29</sup> or EX.15<sup>6</sup> - יְמִינֶךָ דָּה' - "the

INTRODUCTION

right hand of the Lord" - Onkelos translates literally.

Finally, when the Torah speaks about - עֵינֵי ה' -

"the eyes of the Lord" - Onkelos in some instances avoids these representations which would appear to invest the Deity with human eyes. Thus EX.33<sup>12</sup> -

- "thou hast also found favour in my eyes" - Onkelos translates - וּמִן עֵינַי אֶשְׁכַּח -

- "and thou hast also found favour before me". Similar cases of this nature where

the text refers to - עֵינֵי ה' - "the eyes of the

Lord", and Onkelos translates - קִדְּשׁ ה' - "before

the Lord"<sup>30</sup> - can be seen in GEN.6<sup>8</sup>; GEN.38<sup>7</sup>; EX.33<sup>13</sup>; EX.33<sup>15</sup>; EX.33<sup>17</sup>; EX.34<sup>9</sup>; LEV.10<sup>19</sup>; NUM.11<sup>15</sup>; NUM.23<sup>27</sup>; NUM.24<sup>1</sup>; NUM.32<sup>13</sup>; DEUT.4<sup>25</sup>; DEUT.6<sup>18</sup>; DEUT.9<sup>18</sup>; DEUT.12<sup>25</sup>; DEUT.12<sup>28</sup>; DEUT.13<sup>19</sup>; DEUT.17<sup>2</sup>; DEUT.31<sup>29</sup>.

However here too we find inconsistencies in Onkelos' Targum for in DEUT.11<sup>12</sup> - where the Hebrew text reads

- עֵינֵי ה' אֱלֹהֶיךָ בָּהּ - "The eyes of the Lord your God are upon it". Onkelos translates literally.<sup>31</sup>

- עֵינֵי ה' אֱלֹהֶיךָ בָּהּ -

With regard to the Hebrew verb - רָאָה ה' - there are also inconsistencies, for sometimes Onkelos translates

- גִּלִּי קִדְּשׁ ה' - "it was revealed before the Lord",<sup>32</sup> and sometimes literally<sup>33</sup> - וַחֲוָה ה'.

INTRODUCTION

It may, however, be that these inconsistencies were due to the fact that Onkelos' Targum and indeed all the Targumim were originally mainly oral and there was no early standard version to this effect. The Targumim are not a uniform work either by a single author or from a single period. In short, in their present form there is no Aramaic Targum which is older than the fifth century C.E.<sup>34</sup> Furthermore, the "Meturgemanim" (Interpreters) who explained the Torah to their congregants every Sabbath<sup>35</sup>, varied in their approach from one to another. And while one Meturgeman felt the need to avoid the anthropomorphisms of the text, another did not see the need and translated the text as it stood. Most likely it all depended on the kind of audience the "Meturgeman" had and its ability to grasp the deeper meaning of the anti-anthropomorphisms. As we have said in the Halachic Section ("Summary", footnote 34), the Targum Onkelos was priori a translation, strictly literal and only in time, somehow, Halachot, Midrashim, and anti-anthropomorphisms were inserted into Onkelos' Targum. Because of the various Meturgemanim and their attitude towards anthropomorphisms of the Torah one can now understand the various inconsistencies found in Targum Onkelos. One can further understand the reason for several texts being interpreted literally,

INTRODUCTION

while others are anti-anthropomorphically dealt with. This was because it was left completely to the judgement of the "Meturgemanim" who expounded the text according to the time in which they lived. Furthermore, we cannot expect a consistent policy in Onkelos' Targum (or in all the other Targumim) to overcome all the anthropomorphisms of the Hebrew Scriptures. For after all Onkelos' Targum is only a translation from the Hebrew to Aramaic, and is therefore subject to the same limitations of language as the original.<sup>36</sup> Moreover the Targum Onkelos merely reflects the tendency of the theologians and philosophers who exerted great influence on the Jews of the time to study Scriptures in the light of anti-anthropomorphisms. It may, therefore, be said that despite a marked tendency there is no total consistency on this subject in Onkelos' Targum.

Having explained briefly the anthropomorphisms of the Torah and Onkelos' attitude to them, it is possible to concentrate on the extent to which Rashi relies upon Onkelos' translation in this area.

Some scholars are of the opinion that Rashi was certainly not worried about the anthropomorphisms contained in the Old Testament. This statement proves to be inaccurate when one delves more deeply

INTRODUCTION

into Rashi. We shall also prove that in some instances Rashi goes even further than Onkelos in anti-anthropomorphic scruple. First of all although Rashi did not write prefaces<sup>37</sup> outlining his exegetical methods, these can sometimes be reconstructed from occasional statements; and what he has to say in connection with certain bold similies applied to the Deity is of relevance to the consideration of Rashi's attitude to anthropomorphism, in which, language is used which rather than comparing God's activity to man's, apparently credits God with human actions and reactions. Thus for example, Rashi in EX.19<sup>18</sup> has this to say - "As a lion does He (God) roar" (HOSEA 11<sup>10</sup>). But who gave the lion power, if not He, and yet Scripture compares Him only to a lion! But the reason is that we describe Him by comparing Him to His creatures in order to make intelligible to the human ear as much as it can understand. Again (EZ.43<sup>2</sup>) - "And His (God's) voice was like the sound of many waters". - But who gave the waters a thunderous sound except He, and yet you describe Him by comparing Him to His handiwork - it is to make it intelligible to the human ear".<sup>38</sup>

Rashi here has indeed laid down an important rule for the students of the Bible, namely that the Old Testament speaks in "the language of man" when it is referring to the Deity. It is thus quite natural for the Bible to describe super-human occurrence by means of human speech. And for the same reason God's

INTRODUCTION

revelation of himself to man can be described in terms of a person who speaks, breathes, sees, and hears. And all this was written just to enable the human ear to grasp as much as it can understand. And whenever the occasion arose, Rashi, throughout his commentary on the Torah reminded <sup>39</sup>the students of the Bible of this important rule.

We shall now proceed to illustrate with examples the many instances where Rashi, like Onkelos, is concerned to avoid anthropomorphism and in some instances goes further than Onkelos.

A division of the main points regarding "Anthropomorphism" in the Hebrew text into 9 groups facilitates comprehension of Rashi's utilization of the anti-anthropomorphic comments of Onkelos. The groups are as follows:- <sup>40</sup>

Group A. Motion and Place denied God.

Group B. References to Human Form and Organs.

Group C. References to Human Emotions.(Anthropopathisms).

Group D. References to Physical Reaction.



INTRODUCTION

Group E. References to Human Senses.

Group F. Prepositions implying Motion or other  
Corporeality.

Group G. Intermediary Elements (Divine Name Elaborated  
or Substituted).

Group H. Direct and Indirect Softening (Or free  
Substitution).

Group I. References Exposed to Polytheistic  
Interpretation.

GROUP AMotion and Place Denied God

We shall start by examining certain verbs in the Torah ascribing the ideas of motion and place to the Deity and the way in which Onkelos and Rashi avoided the gross anthropomorphism of the text. In certain places of the Hebrew text where the idea of Motion and Place were used in connection with the Deity such as verbs like - קרה, ירד - the Targum Onkelos transferred this idea of Motion to the intermediaries who stand between the Deity and His world. The intermediary terms became known in the targumic literature as "Memra" - "Shechinah" - "Yeqara", and the Angel of the Lord. This idea of intermediary was highly developed by the Targumim<sup>1</sup> and especially by Onkelos. The development of this idea was mainly due to the fact that the concept found in the Torah, God meeting with man, or the idea of God dwelling in certain places, is wholly unacceptable due to the spiritualization of the Theophany. Consequently the "Memra" and the "Shechinah" were used as terms to interpose between God and His interests in the world.

Rashi follows this principle of Onkelos and quite frequently, in a subtle way, substituted the Divine Name for that of the "Shechinah" or the "Angel". It is worthy of note that although several remarks of Rashi can be found in the Midrash and Talmud,

GROUP A

yet the fact that he incorporates them into his commentary, and his style is different to that of the Midrash, proves that Rashi shares the view that the text as it stands is unbecoming of the Deity. Here are some examples to illustrate this point:-

1. The verb - הלך - to walk - EX.34<sup>9</sup> - יֵלֶךְ נָא ה' בְּקִרְבָּנוּ -

"If I have indeed won thy favour, O Lord, then may the Lord go in our company".

The ascription of motion ( יֵלֶךְ ) to God is a gross anthropomorphism. Onkelos, therefore, tones it down and translates - תֵּהֵךְ כַּעַן שְׁכִינָתָא דְהוּא - "Let, I pray, the Shechinah of the Lord go among us". - In other words, Moses asked for the Shechinah<sup>2</sup> of God to go with Israel but not God Himself. Rashi follows the same principle and interprets that Moses had requested that the "Shechinah" of God should rest with Israel only<sup>3</sup> and not on other people.

2. LEV.26<sup>12</sup> - וְהֵיכָלִי בְּתוֹכְכֶם - "And I will walk among you..."

Here too the ascription of motion to God is unacceptable. Onkelos, therefore, tones it down:-

- וְאֶעֱרִי שְׁכִינָתִי בִּיְנִיכֶן - "And I will cause My Shechinah to dwell among you".

Rashi goes further and says:- וְהֵיכָלִי בְּתוֹכְכֶם -

- בְּגִן עֵין כְּאֶחָד מֵכֶם - "I will walk with

GROUP A

you in the Garden of Eden as though I were one of you". As God is incorporeal it will be impossible for Him to walk, in real life, with human beings. Consequently, Rashi says that the text refers to life after death when the spirit which is immortal will be able to perceive and walk (so to speak) with God. In so far as the "walking" of the righteous in the world to come is understood to be something other than normal human walking, it is less problematical theologically to credit the Deity with sharing in this mystical and half-metaphorical "walk".<sup>4</sup> The expression in the Siphra, Parashat Behukotai, (ch.3,15) is - הקב"ה מט"ל

עם הצדיקים בגן עדן לעתיד לבוא -

"In time to come the Holy One Blessed be He will be walking with the righteous people in the Garden of Eden". Thus Rashi has, so to say, "defused" the anthropomorphism by changing the setting and understanding the text metaphorically.

3. Similarly, EX.33<sup>14</sup> - The expression - פני ילכו - "My face shall go with thee" (which is another way of saying I myself will go) is a strong anthropomorphism and Onkelos tones it down by translating - עכ"נתי ירחיק - "My Shechinah shall go".<sup>5</sup>

Rashi also realised the naive conception and he therefore explains:- כתרומתו - לא אשלו עוד מלאך, אט

בעצמי אלך -

GROUP A

"Understand this as the Targum renders it:- My Shechinah will go - I will no longer send a (mere) angel with you, but I myself will<sup>6</sup> go (Myself - means the Shechinah and not a mere - מלאך).

4. Similarly - GEN.5<sup>22</sup> - וַיִּהְיוּ לְךָ חֲנֻכָּה - "And Enoch walked with God".

This idea of man being able to walk with God, which expresses intimacy and close fellowship with God, is an anthropomorphism of a sort, albeit not so strong as one as the crediting of walking to the Deity itself.

Onkelos avoids this by translating - וְהָלַךְ חֲנֻכָּה - "And Enoch walked in the fear<sup>7</sup> of the Lord". Rashi, too, takes the same view - צַדִּיק הָיָה - "He was a righteous man, but his mind was easily induced to turn from his righteous ways and to become wicked". One can see from his interpretation that Rashi has not taken - "walking with God" - in its literal sense.

5. Again in GEN.5<sup>24</sup>; GEN.6<sup>9</sup> - וַיִּהְיוּ לְךָ חֲנֻכָּה - "And Noah walked with God". Onkelos translates - בְּדַחְלֵת דָּה' - "In fear of God Noah walked". Rashi follows Onkelos' interpretation.<sup>8</sup> Thus, since Enoch and Noah are not allowed to walk with God, it may be

GROUP A

said, also that God does not walk with them and so by implication motion is denied God.

6. GEN.17<sup>1</sup> - "Walk before Me and be thou perfect".<sup>9</sup>

This expression is figurative and it denotes the complete obedience to God. Although this expression "to walk before" - is not directly anthropomorphic, (see previous examples, Nos. 4 and 5) yet even here, Onkelos and Rashi did not take the verb - הֵלֵךְ - in its literal sense - but rather in the sense of "worship and service". Thus Onkelos translates:-

- "worship before Me".<sup>10</sup> בִּלְח קִדְמִי -

Rashi also says: - הֵלֵךְ לִפְנֵי - כְּתִרְגֻמוֹ פִּלַּח קִדְמִי הַתּוֹבֵק בְּעֻמּוֹתַי.

Understand this as the Targum takes it:- "Worship before Me - cleave to My service".

Sometimes, however, Rashi goes further than Onkelos in anti-anthropomorphic scruple.

7. The expression DEUT.20<sup>4</sup> - כִּי ה'... הֵלֵךְ עִמָּכֶם - "For the Lord your God will go with you". - Onkelos translates almost literally - אֱמִי ה'... דְּמַדְבֵּר קִדְמִיכֻן - "For the Lord God is He that leads (as a guide) you".

Rashi, on the other hand, palliates this anthropomorphism and thus he says - "The text refers to the camp of the Holy Ark". (The camp that has the Holy Ark in its midst, i.e. the camp of

GROUP A

the Levites - see Bab.Tal.Sot.42<sup>a</sup>).

In other words, it is not God who walks before the Israelites, but rather the Ark of the law. And even if it were to be supposed that the Divine presence is localised in proximity to the Ark, Rashi's silence obscures the theological problem that this would pose. Thus his substitution of the Ark for - ה'הלך - is in effect , an anti-anthropomorphic device.

8. Similarly EX.13<sup>21</sup> - וה' הולך... בעמיו ענן לנחורם הדרך -

"And the Lord went before them by day a pillar of cloud to guide them on their journey". Here also while Onkelos translates fairly closely - וה' מדבר

קדמיהון ביממא בעמורא דעננא לדברותהון באורחא -

Rashi explains the text as follows:- The - ל' - of - לנחורם - is punctuated with "Patach", and it is like - להנחורם - to make them be guided (infinitive Hiphil) - by means of an Agent - who is the cloud of Glory. In other words the guidance was performed not by God but by the cloud of Glory.

Although Rashi's main concern here is to make the text conform with the rules of grammar, nevertheless, he avoids the anthropomorphism by substituting the cloud for God himself as the Agent.<sup>11</sup>

GROUP A

9. The verb - בא - to come. - EX.20<sup>21</sup> - מִן־בְּכָל -  
 - הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר אֶזְכֹּר אֶת שְׁמִי אֵבֹא אֵלֶיךָ וּבֵרַכְתִּיךָ -

"An altar of earth...., wherever I cause my name to be invoked, I will come unto you and bless you".

The flagrant anthropomorphism of the Hebrew text

- אֵבֹא - is obvious. Onkelos, therefore, substitutes the verb - בא - by - שְׁלַח - to send.

"בְּכָל מְדִינָה דִּי אֲשֶׁרִי שְׁכִינְתִּי אֲשַׁלַּח בְּרַכְתִּי לָךְ וְאֶבְרַכְיָךְ -

"In every place where I may cause My Shechinah to dwell thither will I send My blessing and will bless thee".

Rashi, also realising the ascription of motion to

God interprets": - אֵבֹא אֵלֶיךָ - אֲשֶׁרִי שְׁכִינְתִּי עָלֶיךָ -

"I will make My Shechinah rest upon thee".<sup>12</sup>

10. In some instances where the Deity is the subject of the verb - בא - to come - the subject is modified by Onkelos to incorporate the Divine Word - וְאֵתָא מִימְרָא -  
 "And the word came from before the Lord".

e.g.

GEN.20<sup>3</sup> - וַיָּבֹא אֱלֹהִים אֶל־אֲבִימֶלֶךְ -

"And the Lord came to Abimelech".

GEN.31<sup>24</sup> - וַיָּבֹא אֱלֹהִים אֶל־לָבָן -

"And the Lord came to Laban.



GROUP A

NUM.22<sup>9</sup>; NUM.22<sup>20</sup> - וַיָּבֹא אֱלֹהִים אֶל בָּלָעָם -

"And the Lord came to Balaam".

On the other hand in -

EX.19<sup>9</sup> - הִנֵּה אֲנִי בָא אֵלֶיךָ בְּעָבֹת עָנָן -

"Behold I (God) come unto thee, (Moses) in a thick cloud".

EX.20<sup>17</sup> - כִּי לְבַעֲבוֹר נִסּוּת אֵתְכֶם בָּא הָאֱלֹהִים -

"For God is come in order to test you".

DEUT.33<sup>2</sup> - ה' מֵסִינַי בָּא - "The Lord came from Sinai".

Onkelos translates the verb - בָּא - by - אֵיִתְגַּלִּי - and the Lord "revealed" Himself, retaining the Deity itself as subject.

In all these cases, however, motion is denied God.

It appears that when God is said to come (verb - בָּא) to Moses or Israel - אֵיִתְגַּלִּי - is used. Most probably this is done out of consideration of the inspired quality of the prophets of Israel.<sup>13</sup> But

when God appears to the heathen the Targum does not use the verb - אֵיִתְגַּלִּי - but - וַאֲרַמְתָּ מִכֶּה -  
"And the word came".<sup>14</sup>

This subtle distinction of Onkelos was followed by Rashi, who comments on NUM.22<sup>8</sup> - "The Holy Spirit rested upon Balaam at night time only. Similarly, in the case of all the prophets of the heathen peoples; similarly (it came) to Laban in a dream

GROUP A

at night, as it is said (GEN.31<sup>24</sup>) and God came to Laban in a dream of the night". On the other hand, God appeared to Moses<sup>15</sup> and the prophets of Israel with - ג'ל' עב'נ'ר - i.e. revelation of his Presence. (See Rashi NUM.12<sup>4-8</sup>).

One can see from Rashi's comments that he was fully aware that - ה' ב'א - "And God came" - is not in its literal anthropomorphic sense but it simply means - מ'רא'ה דב'ר - vision of the divinely spoken message, i.e. "Divine communication".

11. The verb - י'רד - to go down - EX.19<sup>20</sup> -

- י'רד ה' ע'ל ה'ר ס'ינ'י -

"And the Lord came down upon Sinai".

This ascription is a gross anthropomorphism, Onkelos, therefore, translates - ו'א'ר'ג'ל' - And the Lord was "revealed" on Mount Sinai. Rashi, while he explains the contradiction of the two verses, at the same time avoids the implication of the verb - י'רד - and thus he says:- "One might think that God actually came down upon it! Therefore, it states, (EX.20<sup>19</sup>)

You have seen that I have spoken to you from heaven . These two texts teach us that He bent down the upper and lower heavens and spread them out over the top of the mountain like a bed-spread over a bed, and the <sup>16</sup>throne of Glory descended upon it."

GROUP A

It was therefore the throne of Glory<sup>17</sup> - perhaps another term for "Shechinah" - that came down and not God Himself.

12. Again GEN.11<sup>5</sup> - וירד ה' לראות את העיר -  
 "And the Lord came down to see the city...." -  
 Here, too, the ascription of motion to the Deity has been toned down by Onkelos: - ואתגלי ה' לאתפרעא -  
 "And the Lord was revealed to punish etc"...Rashi, too, in his own way, explains: - "He really did not need to do this ( - לא הוצרך לבך - ), but Scripture intends to teach the judges that they shall not proclaim a defendant guilty before they have seen the case and understood the matter in question".<sup>18</sup> Rashi's words - לא הוצרך לבך - denotes his "theological sensitivity" and his understanding of the naive conception used by the Hebrew text.

13. Similarly GEN.18<sup>21</sup> - ארדה נא ואראה הכצקתה -  
 "I will go down and see etc..."  
 Onkelos explains - אתגלי - by - ארדה -  
 Rashi also avoids the idea of motion and gives two interpretations: - ארדה - לימר לדיינים שלא יפסיקו  
 דיני נפשות אלא בראיה -

GROUP A

This is a metaphor for there was no need for God to go down and see; it merely teaches the judges that they should not give decisions in cases involving capital punishment, except after having carefully looked into the matter -

דבר אחר ארדה נא לסוף מעשה

Another explanation of - ארדה - is: I will go down to the very end (i.e. get to the very bottom) of their doings. In other words - ארדה נא - should not be taken in its literal sense, but rather in the sense of - "I will fathom the depths of their wickedness". One can see that while Rashi explains the text, at the same time he avoids all sorts of anthropomorphism.

14. The verb - עבר - to pass.

EX.34<sup>6</sup> - וַעֲבֹר ה' עַל פָּנָיו - "and the Lord passed before him".

This ascription of motion is unbecoming of the Deity.

Onkelos, therefore, translates - וַאֲעֲבֹר ה' שְׁכִינָתוֹ - "And the Lord made His "Shechinah" pass before his face".

Rashi follows Onkelos' principle and in verse 8 he comments - בַּשָּׂמַיִם מֵשָׁה עָבְרָה מִלְּפָנָיו  
"When Moses saw that the "Shechinah" passed by he immediately prostrated himself".

GROUP A

15. Similarly - EX.12<sup>12</sup> - ועברתי בארץ מצרים בלילה הזה -  
For I will pass through the land of Egypt etc....

Onkelos translates - ואניגלית בארץ מצרים -  
"And I will appear<sup>19</sup> in the land of Egypt etc."

Here, too, Rashi was aware of the ascription of motion and thus he explains: - כמלך הקיבור ועברתי -

"This is not to be taken literally (it is here used metaphorically of God) but is speaking of God as one speaks of a king who passes from place to place,<sup>20</sup> etc". If the anthropomorphism is not exactly eliminated, its immediacy is (as in instances noted above) palliated and thus rendered less theologically startling.

16. The verb - פסח - to leap - EX.12<sup>13</sup> -  
- וראיתי את הדם ופסחתי עליכם -  
"And when I see the blood I will leap over you".  
The idea of God "springing over" from house to house is a disturbing anthropomorphism; Onkelos therefore paraphrases by - ואיחוס עליכון -  
I will spare you.<sup>21</sup> Rashi gives two interpretations. Firstly like Onkelos and Menachem Ben Seruk that - וחמלתי - is to be interpreted as - ופסחתי -  
and I will spare you, and then his own explanation that the root - פסח - means leaping and springing over. (ופסחתי - וחמלתי.. ואני אומר כל פסיחה לשון דלוג )

וקפצה

GROUP A

In EX.12<sup>23</sup> on the same verb Rashi says - אֵל-וּמַלְאָכָיו - the verb - אֵל - signifies - to spare - He will spare; the term - וּמַלְאָכָיו is a rare formula in Rashi and <sup>perhaps</sup> what he means by it is - "strictly speaking" - one should translate it - וּלְאֵל - and "he will leap over them". In all likelihood, Rashi means that in these passages the verb - אֵל - should be taken metaphorically in the sense of "sparing" although (as he is fully aware) its literal meaning is "springing over". It may be said that Rashi was compelled to do so in order to avoid the strong anthropomorphism which this expression involves.<sup>22</sup>

17. The verb - קָרָה - to meet.

EX.19<sup>17</sup> - וַיּוֹצֵא מֹשֶׁה אֶת הָעָם לִקְרַאת הָאֱלֹהִים - "And Moses brought the people out from the camp to meet God".

The idea of God meeting the people is somehow unacceptable. Onkelos, therefore, tones it down by saying - לִקְרַאת מִימְרָא - to meet the "Memra" of God. In other words the people went out to meet not God, but rather His intermediary the "Memra".<sup>23</sup> Although Rashi has not used the concept of the "Memra" in his commentary, yet he realised the anthropomorphism of this expression, and he also may have toned it

GROUP A

down by saying - מגיד שהשכינה יוצאה לקראתם -  
 "It teaches that the "Shechinah" was going forth to  
 meet them, as a bridegroom who goes out to meet  
 his bride".<sup>24</sup> The interpretation of Onkelos and  
 Rashi is an example of the denial of localisation  
 to God.

18. The verb - פגש - to meet.

EX.4<sup>24</sup> - ויהי בדרך במלון ופגשוהו ה' -

"During the journey, while....the Lord met him  
 (Moses), meaning to kill him".

This expression - "The Lord met him" - is considered  
 totally unacceptable, Onkelos, therefore avoids it  
 by saying - וקרץ ביה מלאכא דה' -

And the Angel of the Lord met him. Rashi, in his  
 own way, also explains that it was the Angel who became  
 like a serpent and sought to kill him.<sup>25</sup> The exegesis<sup>26</sup>  
 is, of course, older than Rashi, who is selective in  
 the Midrashim which he quotes and on the whole avoids  
 quoting fantastic ones. The fact that he does so here  
 may well be occasioned by his concern to eliminate  
 a gross anthropomorphism in what is in any case a  
 most perplexing passage.

GROUP A

19. The verb - יָצַד - to designate or point out, may have localising implications, since it can mean to meet by appointment. Thus another example of the denial of place to God is:

EX.29<sup>43</sup> - וְנִפְגַּשְׁתִּי שָׁמָּה לְבֶנֶי יִשְׂרָאֵל -

"And there I will meet with the children of Israel".

The expression - וְנִפְגַּשְׁתִּי - is a gross anthropomorphism.

Onkelos tones it down - וְאֵמֵן מִיָּמַי - "And I will appoint My "Memra".<sup>27</sup> Rashi, in his own way, follows

the same principle - אֶתְּנוּךְ עִמָּם בְּדִבּוּר - "I will meet together with them in a communication by speech.

In other words the meeting between God and His subjects will not be in a physical sense, facing each other, but only in the - בְּדִבּוּר - through the medium of speech, or in Onkelos' words the "Memra". Furthermore, when delving into the second part of Rashi's interpretation one will undoubtedly see his sensitivity in moderating this anthropomorphism - כַּמֶּלֶךְ הַקּוֹבֵץ מִקּוֹדֶשׁ מוֹעֵד לְדַבֵּר -

עִם עַבְדָּיו -

"This is not to be taken literally (it is here used as a metaphor) but is speaking of God as one speaks of a king who appoints a place of meeting, where he will speak with his subjects". The simile - כַּמֶּלֶךְ - is purely to stress that - וְנִפְגַּשְׁתִּי - should not be taken literally but rather metaphorically.



GROUP A20. The verb - שכן - to dwell.

The idea of God dwelling in a place is, if construed literally, certainly unbecoming of the Deity and, here also Onkelos and Rashi<sup>28</sup> avoided the anthropomorphism of the text. In this instance the situation is complicated by the fact that some of the biblical passages concerned had themselves generated the concept of the Shechinah - the Divine quality of "indwelling presence": a concept which, largely purified of geographical implications and impregnated with notions of immanence, constitutes a topic of major importance in Jewish theology.

The first example is NUM.5<sup>3</sup> - וְלֹא יִטְמְאוּ אֶת מִחַנְהֶם  
אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי שׁוֹכֵן בְּתוֹכָם

"And they shall not defile their camp in the midst thereof I dwell".

Onkelos interprets that it is the "Shechinah"<sup>29</sup> that dwells in the midst of Israel. Rashi also takes the verse to mean - מִחַנֵּה שְׁכִינָה - "the camp of the Shechinah" - and thus he explains in verse 2 -

The text speaks about a person who had become unclean (by reason of a corpse - טִמְאָה לְנֶפֶשׁ)

and was not allowed to enter the camp of the "Shechinah". And so Rashi, while primarily concerned to explain the text, yet at the same time, avoids the anthropomorphism of the Hebrew text.

GROUP A

21. Similarly NUM.35<sup>34</sup> - כִּי אֲנִי ה' שׁוֹכֵן בְּתוֹךְ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל -  
 "For I the Lord dwell among the children of Israel".  
 Onkelos, once again, translates. אֲרִי אֲנִי ה' דִּשְׁכְּנִתִּי. -  
 אֲרִי - "For I the Lord whose Shechinah etc". Rashi  
 follows the same concept - אֶף בְּזִמְנֵי שֶׁהֵם טְמֵאִים -  
 שְׁכִינָה בִּינֵהֶם -  
 "For even when the Israelites are unclean the Shechinah  
 remains amongst them".
22. Similarly the expression NUM.11<sup>20</sup> -  
 - יֵן כִּי מֵאִסְתֵּה אֵת ה' מֵעַר בְּקִרְבְּכֶם -  
 "The Lord who dwells in your midst" - may be said to  
 imply a verb of dwelling among you, and consequently  
 Onkelos tones it down by saying - חֵלֶף דִּקְצִיתוֹן  
 בְּמִמְרָא דֵה' דִּשְׁכְּנִתִּי עֲרִיא בִּיטְכוֹן -  
 "Because you have rejected the Memra of the Lord whose  
 Shechinah<sup>30</sup> dwells among you". Rashi, as said above,  
 follows this principle, and thus he says: "Had I not  
 planted My "Shechinah" among you, your heart would not  
 have become so arrogant as to enter into all these  
 matters".<sup>31</sup>
23. DEUT.33<sup>16</sup> - וְרָצוֹן שָׁכַן סִנְה - Onkelos translates  
 - "whose Shechinah is in Heaven".  
 Rashi says - הַקִּבֵּה הַנִּגְלָה עָלַי בִּסְנָה -

GROUP A

"God who revealed Himself in the thornbush".

Rashi was careful in saying - הנגלה - God who revealed Himself - and not - העובן בסנה - God who dwells in the thornbush.

24. The verb - נשא - to lift up.

EX.19<sup>4</sup> - ואשא אתכם על כנפי נשרים -

"And how I bore you on eagle's wings". The idea of God lifting up Israel is certainly disturbing. Rashi therefore explains as follows:- "Onkelos translates

- ואס'י אתכם - ואשא - as though it were - ואס'י אתכם - viz., ואטלית יתכון, <sup>32</sup> And I made you travel; he adapted the expression in a manner that is consonant with the respect due to God's transcendent superiority.<sup>33</sup>

25. Similarly DEUT.32<sup>40</sup> - כי אשא אל עמים -

"For I lift up my hand to heaven". Rashi (in his second interpretation) says :- כי אשא - כמו כי נשאתי

תמיד אט מערה מקום שכינתי בעמים כתרגומן ...  
ידי - מקום שכינתי -

"The first two words - כי אשא - are equivalent to

- כי נשאתי - "because I have lifted up" - and the text means: I always make the heaven the dwelling place of My Glory, as the Targum takes it. - ידי - "My hand" - means the place of My Divine

GROUP A

Glory. Furthermore, even in his first interpretation Rashi does not take the text literally, but in the sense of - אָבִיעֶר - oath.<sup>34</sup> And so, once again, Onkelos and Rashi have toned down the ascription of motion to the Deity.

GROUP BReferences to Human Form and Organs

In their attempt to spiritualise the conception of God, Onkelos and Rashi to a great extent avoided these flagrant anthropomorphisms of the Hebrew text, which if understood literally would credit the Deity with human form. Here are some examples to illustrate this point.

1. EX.15<sup>3</sup> - ה' איש מלחמה - "The Lord is a man of war." The idea of describing God as man is unacceptable. Onkelos, therefore, translates - ה' מרי נצחן קרביא - "The Lord is the Master of victory in battles". Rashi, too, protects the incorporeality of God by explaining "that - איש - does not mean "man" but rather - בעל - Master of war; just as (RUTH 1<sup>3</sup>) - איש נעמי - Master of Naomi. And whenever the words - איש - and - אישך - occur they must be translated by - בעל - Master".<sup>1</sup>
  
2. NUM.12<sup>8</sup> - ותמונת ה' יביט - "And the similitude of the Eternal shall he behold". The very idea of ascribing - תמונה - "form" to God is unacceptable as God has no shape or form. Accordingly Onkelos renders: - ודמות יקרא דה' משהכל - "And he shall behold the likeness of the Glory"<sup>2</sup> of the Lord. Accordingly, Moses beheld only

GROUP B

the Glory of God. Rashi in a remarkable way avoids the anthropomorphism: *וְתִמְנֶנֶת - זֶה מֵרֵאשִׁית אַחֲרֵיהֶם*  
*בְּעֵינַי שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר וּרְאִיתָ אֶת אַחֲרָיו -*  
 This (similitude) refers to beholding the after -  
 [effects] of God's providence.

3. Similarly GEN.1<sup>26</sup> - *נַעֲשֶׂה אָדָם בְּצַלְמֵנוּ כְּדִמוּתֵינוּ* -  
 "Let us make man in our image and likeness..."  
 The word "likeness" is objectionable. It is  
 interesting to note that while Onkelos translates  
 literally<sup>3</sup> .... *נַעֲבִיד אִינְשָׁא כְּצַלְמֵנָא כְּדִמוּתֵנָא*  
 Rashi goes further and explains: - *כְּדִמוּתֵינוּ - לְהַבִּין*  
*וְלִהְיוֹת כִּי -* "with the power to comprehend and to  
 discern". One can see how careful Rashi was in  
 suppressing the anthropomorphism.<sup>4</sup>

4. LEV.17<sup>10</sup> - *וְנִתְּתִי פָנַי בְּנֶפֶשׁ הַאֲכֹלֶת אֶת הַדָּם*  
 "I will set my face against that soul that eateth blood  
 etc".  
 The ascription of - *פָּנַי* - "face" to God is a gross  
 anthropomorphism.. Onkelos, therefore, tones it down  
 by translating - *וְאֵתְנָן רֹגְזִי* - And I will set my  
 anger.<sup>5</sup>  
 Rashi following Ps. Jonathan explains as follows:-<sup>6</sup>  
*וְנִתְּתִי פָנַי - פָּנָאִי עָלַי - פּוֹנֶה אֶת מַלְאָכֵי וְעוֹסֵק בּוֹ -*

GROUP B

"the word - פני - is taken by paronomasia as indicating - פנאי עלי - "My leisure" - i.e. I will turn away from all My [other] affairs and concern Myself with him only".

5. EX.20<sup>3</sup> - לא יהיה לך אלהים אחרים על פני - "Thou shalt have no other gods before my face".  
 Whatever the unusual expression - על פני - may mean, its literal meaning is just unacceptable. Onkelos takes it to mean - לא ירדיו לך אלה אחרן ברמני - thou shalt have no other gods except Me. Rashi, also suppresses the anthropomorphism by taking - על פני - to mean - כל זמן שאני קיים - "so long as I exist".<sup>8</sup>

6. DEUT.5<sup>4</sup> - פנים בפנים דבר ה' - "The Lord talked with you face to face".  
 Onkelos interprets: - ממלל עם ממלל מילל ה' - "Word with word" (i.e. speech for speech) hath the Lord spoken with you".<sup>9</sup>  
 Rashi, too, avoids the naive conception of - פנים - and says - הרי המוכר עצמו מדבר עמכם - "Behold the seller (God) Himself is speaking to you".  
 In other words it is (using Onkelos' expression)

GROUP B

the "Memra", the intermediary element, which you have heard speaking to you. Perhaps, however, Rashi mitigates the anthropomorphism by at least eliminating the reference to God's face and substituting (quite arbitrarily) דבור - "speech" to God.

This expression - פנים אל פנים - occurs once again in DEUT.34<sup>10</sup> and it is most interesting to note that while Onkelos translates literally<sup>10</sup> - אפין

- באפין - Rashi palliates this by explaining:-  
 - מדבר אליו בכל עת שירצה - "And (Moses) spoke to Him (God) at any time he desired". In other words this familiarity which is expressed by - פנים אל פנים - consisted of - דבור - "speech" only.

7. In most<sup>11</sup> cases whenever the expression - עיני ה' - "the eyes of the Lord" occurs in the Bible, Onkelos translates<sup>12</sup> - קדם ה' - "Before the Lord".<sup>13</sup>  
 In DEUT.12<sup>28</sup> - כי תעשה הטוב והישר בעיני ה' -

"For you will be doing what is good and right in the eyes of the Lord". - Rashi who realised this anthropomorphism has this to say :- הטוב בעיני השמים - This refers to an action that is proper in the eyes of Heaven.<sup>14</sup>

The change from - עיני ה' - to - עיני השמים - is not accidental, but rather a deliberate one, in order to avoid the naive conception that God has human eyes.



GROUP B

8. NUM.9<sup>18</sup> - על פי ה' יחנו ועל פי ה' יסעו -

"At the command of the Lord they encamped and at the command of the Lord they journeyed".

The word - פה - "mouth" - when used of God came to mean "command", as that which came from the mouth; and this was done in order to avoid the anthropomorphism that the Deity has a human mouth. In this sense Onkelos, throughout the Torah, takes<sup>15</sup> it - על בי מִמְרָא דה' - Rashi also explains that - עמוד הענן היה מתמר וצולה - על פי ה' - means: - through the signs of the "pillar of cloud", i.e. if the pillar of cloud rolled itself up (contracted itself) and extended itself out above the camp of the sons of Judah, like a beam, then they journeyed. If the pillar of cloud rose in a column and extended itself above the sons of Judah like the roof of a hut (10/כרה) then they encamped. As said above, Rashi while he explains the text, at the same time, removes all sort of anthropomorphisms which are an affront to the Deity.

9. EX.33<sup>22</sup> - ושכתי כפי עליך -

"And I will shelter thee with my hand while I pass by."

To avoid the anthropomorphism - (כפי) - Rashi quotes Onkelos: - וכרגומו, ואגין במימרי, כיניו לירך כבוד - על מקלה שאינו צריך לסוכך עליו בכף מקא -

GROUP B

The Targum renders - *ושכתי כפי* - by  
 - *ואגין במימרי*<sup>16</sup> - "I will protect thee with My word". This is merely a circumlocutory substitution in a manner more respectful to God's transcendent superiority; and the Targum did not translate it literally because God does not need to cover him (Moses) with the actual hand in order to protect him". Similarly on verse 23, Rashi further says - *והסרתיו ותרגמו* - "And I will remove My hand" - *כפי* - *ואערי ית דברתי יקרי, כשאסלק הנהגת כבולי מנגד פנך ללכת*<sup>17</sup>  
 The Targum renders this by - "I will remove the guidance<sup>17</sup> of my Glory from before your eyes - to move forward from that place".

10. DEUT.33<sup>3</sup> - *כל קרשיו בידך, והם תכו לרגליך* -  
 "All his saints are in thy hand, and they sat down at thy feet, etc".

Again Onkelos and Rashi attempt to avoid these gross anthropomorphisms which credit the Deity with human hands and feet. Onkelos therefore translates:-

- *כל קדישוי בית ישראל בגבורא מפיקינון מקצריש ואנון דמדברין*<sup>18</sup>  
 "with power, He took out of Egypt all the<sup>18</sup> holy

ones of the house of Israel, and they are the ones who were led under thy cloud".<sup>19</sup> Rashi, also

paraphrases the text and gives two interpretations:

GROUP B

Firstly - בִּידְךָ - נִפְשׁוֹת הַצְדִּיקִים גִּנוּזוֹת אִתּוֹ -  
 The word "thy hand" - is not to be taken literally,  
 but it means - the souls of the righteous are stored  
 up with Him. - תַּחְתִּית - רַגְלֶיךָ - "thy feet" means -  
 - הַהָר לְרַגְלֶיךָ בְּסִינַי - "Within the underpart  
 of the mountain unto thy foot - which is - at Sinai.  
 Another interpretation - קִדְשׁוֹ בִּידְךָ - means -  
 - צְדִיקִים לְבָקוּ בְּךָ - their righteous people clave  
 to you. (i.e. worship you).

11. Similarly - DEUT.33<sup>27</sup> - וּמִתַּחַת זְרוּעוֹת עוֹלָם -  
 "And underneath are the everlasting arms". The meaning  
 is perhaps vague, and nothing in the context determines  
 that the arms are those of the Deity. Onkelos, however,  
 assumes that they are and attempts to avoid a human  
 conception of the Deity, as can be seen from his  
 translation: - זְרוּעוֹת עוֹלָם - בְּמִקְרִיהֶם מִתְּצַבֵּי עוֹלָם  
 With His "Memra" the word was made.<sup>20</sup> For Rashi there  
 is no problem of anthropomorphism, since he understands  
 that the - זְרוּעוֹת - "arms" - do not refer to the  
 Deity - but - בְּעָלֵי זְרוּעָה, כְּגֹן סִיחֹן וְעֹג - all  
 the mighty men ("men of strong arms") such as Sihon  
 and Og, and the kings of Canaan who were the strength  
 and might of the world.

12. EX.13<sup>6</sup> - "Thy right hand, O Lord....." - יְמִינְךָ ה' נִאֲרִי בָכָה

Also DEUT.33<sup>2</sup> - "From His right hand went a fire of the Law for them" - מִיְמֵינוֹ אֵשׁ דָּרַךְ לָמוֹ

It is strange to see that in these cases Onkelos translates literally<sup>21</sup> - יְמִינְךָ - and - כִּתְּבָה יְמִינֵךָ - respectively.

Rashi, on the other hand, remarked on this naive conception for in GEN.1<sup>26</sup> he comments on the verse (I. Kings, 22<sup>19</sup>) "I saw the Lord sitting on His throne, and all the host of Heaven standing by Him on His right hand and on His left - Has God, then, a right hand and a left hand? No, but it means that some stood "on the right side" to plead in favour of the accused and others stood "on the left side" to accuse. This comment shows Rashi's sensitivity in avoiding any human conception associated with the Deity.

13. DEUT.32<sup>40</sup> - "For I lift up My hand to heaven" - כִּי אֲשֹׁמָה אֶל שָׁמַיִם יְדִי

The word - יְדִי - "My hand" is certainly a crude anthropomorphism. Onkelos, therefore, takes it to mean:-

- אֲרִי אֶתְקַנִּית בַּשָּׁמַיִם בֵּית שְׁכִינָתִי -

"For I have established in heaven the place of My Shechinah."

Rashi, (in his second interpretation) who realises the naivete of this conception, quotes the Targum and says

- יְדִי - "My hand" - means - the place of My Divine Glory.<sup>22</sup>

GROUP CReferences to Human EmotionsAnthropopathisms

Human feelings are attributed to God in the Old Testament. God loves, hates, repents, fears and grieves. In other words, God is subject to all passions and emotions of a human being. (Sometimes called "anthropopathisms" rather than "anthropomorphisms"). As these emotions are objectionable in connection with God, some attempt has been made by Onkelos and Rashi to avoid or disguise these anthropomorphic conceptions. The following examples illustrate this point:

1. GEN. 6<sup>6a</sup> - וַיִּנָּחֵם ה' כִּי עָשָׂה אֶת הָאָדָם - "And the Eternal repented". The idea of repentance is definitely a gross anthropomorphism, for as God knows the future, he can never experience the feeling of repentance. Onkelos, therefore, tones it down - וַיִּתֵּב ה' בְּמִמְרָאֵהּ - "And the Lord repented in His "Memra".<sup>1</sup> In other words, the repentance is not directed to God, but rather to His "Memra". Rashi, in a *bold stroke* weakened the anthropomorphism and took the verb<sup>2</sup> - נָחַם - not in the sense to repent, but rather - to comfort - and thus he says: - נִחְמָה הִיְתָה לְפָנָיו שֶׁבָּרָא בְּתַחֲבוּשָׁתוֹ, עָאִילוּ הֵי מִן הָעֲלִיּוֹנִים הֵי מִמְרֵידֵם.

"It was a consolation to Him that He had created man on earth, for had he been one of the heavenly beings, he would have incited them to rebel against God".

GROUP C

2. GEN.6<sup>6b</sup> - וַיִּתְעַצֵּב אֱלֹהִים לְבוֹ "And it grieved Him in his heart". This conception is unfitting to the Deity. Consequently, Rashi<sup>3</sup> quotes Onkelos who tones it down [וַאֲמַר בְּמִימְרֵיהֶּ לְמַתְבָּר תִּקְפֶּהוּן כְּרִצּוֹתֶיהֶּ] In the mind of God man became an object to be punished: it entered God's heart to grieve him. And in case this is not satisfactory, Rashi goes further and alludes to the story of Rabbi Joshua. A gentile had asked the latter to explain to him the text. Do you not admit that God knows what is to happen in the future? The Rabbi replied, "yes". The gentile retorted - but is it not written and "He was grieved in His heart"? He answered: "have you ever had a son born to you"? He replied, "yes, and on that occasion, I rejoiced and made others rejoice also". The Rabbi asked him: "But did you not know that he must die"? To this the heathen replied: "At the time of joy let there be joy, at the time of mourning, let there be mourning". The Rabbi then said: "such too is the way of God". By quoting this story from the Midrash, (GEN. Rabbah.27.4) Rashi is simply reminding the reader that "the Torah speaks the language of man".

3. DEUT.32<sup>27</sup> - וְלֹא יִתְעַצֵּב אֱלֹהִים כִּי יִשְׁתָּחֲוּ לְאֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים "But I feared that I should be provoked by their foes". The idea of fear attributed to God is certainly disturbing. Onkelos, therefore, translates - אֱלֹהִים לֹא יִתְעַצֵּב

GROUP C

- רגומ דסנאה כניש - "Were it not that the wrath of the enemy would be gathered together".  
 Rashi also without quoting Onkelos avoids the anthropomorphism and takes - אגור - not from the verb - אגר ( a bye-form of - יגר - ) to fear - but from - אגר - to gather<sup>4</sup> - And thus Rashi explains: אגור - אמר לא שבקס האויב בנוס עליהם להשקת  
 "Were it not that the wrath of the enemy were heaped up - (אגור) against them to destroy them".

4. LEV.26<sup>30</sup> - וגעלה נפשי אתכם "And My soul shall loathe you".

The idea of loathing and hating attributed to God is, once again disturbing. Onkelos, therefore, explains:-

- ורחק מימרי יתכון - "And My Memra<sup>5</sup> shall put you at a distance". Rashi realising the anthropomorphism explains:- וגעלה נפשי אתכם - זה סילוק  
 עבירה -

"This refers to the departure of the Shechinah from their midst".

However, in this area also, Onkelos does not follow a consistent policy for in several cases of emotions such as - קצף - or - חרון אף - "the wrath of the Lord" - EX.4<sup>14</sup>; LEV.26<sup>28</sup>; NUM.11<sup>10</sup>; NUM.25<sup>3-4</sup>; NUM.32<sup>14</sup>; DEUT.11<sup>17</sup>; DEUT.13<sup>18</sup>. - Onkelos translates literally<sup>6</sup>.

GROUP C

Similarly, expressions of love, compassion and hatred  
- GEN.19<sup>16</sup>; EX.12<sup>13</sup>; EX.22<sup>26</sup>; EX.34<sup>6</sup>; DEUT.1<sup>27</sup>;  
DEUT.4<sup>31</sup>; DEUT.10<sup>18</sup>; DEUT.13<sup>18</sup>; Onkelos translates  
literally. <sup>7</sup>



GROUP DReferences to Physical Reactions

Human reactions are also attributed to God, in the Hebrew Scriptures, and here also Onkelos and Rashi avoid the anthropomorphic conceptions. Two examples of this nature will suffice to illustrate this point.

1. EX.32<sup>11</sup> - ..... וַיַּחַל מֹשֶׁה אֶת פְּנֵי יְיָ - "And Moses besought the face of the Eternal", etc. The verb - חָלַה - in the "Piel" means to make pleasant, (literally, sweet; Arabic - خَلَّى ) to appease,<sup>1</sup> and used mainly with - פָּנֶה - face. Thus Moses made the face of God sweet and pleasant. This strong anthropomorphism is avoided by Onkelos who renders the text - וַצִּלִּי מַעֲרָה - "And Moses prayed before the Lord. Rashi also has taken it in the sense of praying and entreating. For in verse 10 on the expression - וַתִּפְתָּח הַנִּיחָה לִּי - "Let me alone" - Rashi comments that by saying this God "opened the door" to him (offered him a suggestion) intimating that if he prayed for them He would not destroy them.
2. EX.31<sup>17</sup> - וַיִּבֹּשׂ הָעֶבֶרֶץ שִׁבְתָּ וַיִּנָּפֶשׂ - "And on the seventh day He ceased from work and rested".<sup>2</sup> The idea of God being refreshed or rested

GROUP D

is simply a misconception. To our surprise Onkelos and Ps. Jonathan translate closely: - **וביומא שביצאה**

- **עברת ונת** - Rashi, however, with his usual sensitivity, warns the reader of this expression, which seems to detract from the majesty of God. Thus he says: - **וינפץ - כתיגומא, ונת; ומי שכתוב**

**בו לא יצף ולא יגץ, וכל פצלו במקמר הכתיב**  
**מנוחה לצצמו, לעבר האון מה שהיא**  
**יכולה לעמוץ -**

"Take the meaning of - **וינפץ** - as the Targum renders it - **ונח** - and He rested -. But God of whom it is written (IS.40<sup>28</sup>)...."the Lord the Creator of the ends of the earth fainteth not nor is He weary", and whose every action is accomplished by *his word*, dictated a text which ascribes repose to Him. This is in order to make comprehensible to the human ear what it is capable of understanding.

GROUP EReference to Human Senses

In this chapter we shall deal briefly with human senses, attributed to God in the Old Testament. God revealed Himself to the Israelites as a being who has personal dealings with mankind. This personal conception of God has led to frequent anthropomorphic expressions about the Deity. Thus we read in Scriptures God breathes, sees, hears, smells and speaks. Although the writer concerned was it seems quite <sup>un</sup>inhibited in his use of this kind of language, to later and more sophisticated generations those attributions were felt to be a disparagement of God's honour and to debase His Majesty. Onkelos and Rashi therefore endeavoured to eradicate these representations which apparently invested the Deity with human senses. A few examples will suffice to illustrate this subject.

1. EX.15<sup>8</sup> - "And with the blast of thy nostrils" - וברוח אפך נערמו מים

The idea of God breathing is disturbing. Onkelos, therefore, tones it down - "And by the word of thy mouth".<sup>1</sup> ובמימר פומך

Rashi with his usual sensitivity warns the reader about this anthropomorphism: - דבר הכתוב - רוח אפך

כביכול בשכינה, דוגמה מלך בער ודם כדי להשמיץ און הבריות כפי ההוה שיוכלו להבין דבר -

GROUP E

"Scripture speaks - if this were at all permitted to say - of the Shechinah in the same manner as it does of a human monarch, in order to make people's ears hear the facts in accordance with what really happens so that they may understand the matter". In other words, Rashi teaches that the Torah speaks in the language of man.<sup>2</sup>

2. LEV.1<sup>9</sup> - אֵשׁ רִיחַ נִיחֹחַ - "An offering made by fire of sweet savour unto the Lord".

The anthropomorphism is blatant, Onkelos, therefore, tones it down - קָרְבַּן דְּמִתְקַבֵּל בְּרָעוּא קֹדֶשׁ ה' - "A sacrifice to be received with acceptance before the Lord". Rashi, in a remarkable exposition explains: - רִיחַ נִיחֹחַ - נִחַת רוּחַ לִפְנֵי שְׁמֵרְתִּי וְנִשְׁעָה רְצוֹנִי -

An odour of - נִיחֹחַ - "one that causes satisfaction to Me by the knowledge that I gave command and that My will was executed".<sup>3</sup>

3. EX.12<sup>13</sup> - וּרְאִיתִי אֶת הַדָּם -

"And when I see the blood....."

Whilst Onkelos translates literally<sup>4</sup> - וְאִמְנִי יֵת דְּמָא -

Rashi goes further: - וּרְאִיתִי - הַכֹּל גָּלוּי לִפְנֵי, אֵלָּא אִמְרַ -

הַקִּבְּהָ נֹתֵן מֵנִי אֵת עֵינִי לִרְאוּת שְׂמֵתָם עֲסוּקִים  
בְּמִצְוֹתַי, וְפֹסֵחַ אֵת עֲלֵיכֶם -

GROUP E

But surely everything is manifest to Him (and He therefore did not need to look whether the blood had been put on the door posts). But the meaning is: God says, I will take notice of the fact that you are engaged in the performance of My commandments and I will spare you.<sup>5</sup>

In other places the verb - ראה - in connection with God is translated by Onkelos as - גלי קדש יה' - .

"It was revealed before the Lord". e.g. GEN.31<sup>12</sup>; GEN.29<sup>32</sup>; EX.3<sup>7</sup>; EX.4<sup>31</sup>; Maimonides, Guide to the

Perplexed, Kafih edition, op.cit.v.1.ch.48, makes a subtle distinction between these two interpretations

of Onkelos:- מצאתי כי כאשר הוא (אונקלוס) מוצא את הראיה בעוול, או נזק או פשע מתרגמו גלי קדש יה'. אין ספק כי מזה באותו הלשון משמע להעגה והנחת הדבר שהושג כפי שהושג במקום שהוא, ולפיכך אם מצא שהראיה קשורה בעוול אינו אומר וזא אלא וגלי קדש יה'.

In short, whenever the verb - ראה - is connected

with violence, wickedness, or injustice Onkelos

translates - גלי קדש יה' - (e.g. GEN.29<sup>32</sup>; GEN.31<sup>12</sup>; EX.2<sup>25</sup>; EX.3<sup>17</sup>; EX.3<sup>9</sup>; EX.4<sup>31</sup>; EX.32<sup>9</sup>; DEUT.32<sup>19</sup>; DEUT.32<sup>36</sup>). But when the subject in

question is regarded with favour by God, then

Onkelos translates the verb - ראה - by - וזא - (e.g. GEN.1<sup>4</sup>; GEN.1<sup>18</sup>; GEN.1<sup>31</sup>; EX.3<sup>4</sup>; EX.12<sup>13</sup>).

Maimonides noticed, however, that in the following three places, Onkelos translated the verb - ראה -

GROUP E

by -  $\text{וְיָנִי}$  - although according to his fine distinction, Onkelos should have translated it by -  $\text{וּגְלִי קִדְשׁ ה'}$  - GEN.6<sup>5</sup>; GEN.6<sup>12</sup>; GEN.29<sup>31</sup>. Maimonides believed that Onkelos' version in these three places is incorrect.

4. Similarly when the verb -  $\text{שָׁמַע}$  - to hear - is connected with the Deity, Onkelos avoids the anthropomorphism and translates -  $\text{שְׁמִיעַ קִדְשׁ ה'}$  - "It was heard before the Lord". (e.g. GEN.21<sup>17</sup>; GEN.29<sup>33</sup>; EX.3<sup>7</sup>; EX.6<sup>5</sup>; EX.16<sup>7</sup>; EX.16<sup>8</sup>; EX.16<sup>9</sup>; EX.16<sup>12</sup>; NUM.14<sup>27</sup>). In other instances, when the verb -  $\text{שָׁמַע}$  - is connected with prayer, Onkelos translates it by -  $\text{קִבֵּל}$  - "accepting".<sup>6</sup> e.g. GEN.16<sup>11</sup> -  $\text{כִּי שָׁמַע ה' אֶל עֲנִיךָ}$  - "Because the Lord hath heard thy affliction" -  $\text{אֲדֹנִי קִבֵּל ה'}$  -  $\text{צִלּוֹתֶיךָ}$  - "For the Lord has accepted your prayer".<sup>7</sup> c.f. EX.22<sup>22</sup>; EX.22<sup>26</sup>; NUM.20<sup>16</sup>; DEUT.1<sup>45</sup>. Maimonides<sup>8</sup> praised Onkelos for being so careful in making these subtle distinctions and thus avoiding the anthropomorphism of the text. It is interesting to note that Rashi also was fully aware of Onkelos' distinctions and in GEN.37<sup>27</sup>, he makes the following comment:-

וְשָׁמַע - וּקִבֵּל מִיָּד - וְכָל שְׁמִיעָה שֶׁהִיא קִבְלַת דְּבָרִים  
בְּגוֹן זֶה, וְכַגוֹן וְשָׁמַע יִעֲקֹב אֶל אָבִיו, נִעְשֶׂה וְשָׁמַע, מִתְּרַגֵּם  
נִקְבֵּל. וְכָל שֶׁהִיא שְׁמִיעַת הָאָז, בְּגוֹן וְשָׁמַע אֶת ה' אֱלֹהֵיךָ  
מִתְּהַלֵּךְ בְּגוֹן, וְרַבְּקָה שָׁמְעָה, וְשָׁמַע יִשְׂרָאֵל, שְׁמִיעַת אֵת תְּלֻנוֹת  
כּוֹל מִתְּרַגֵּם וְשָׁמַע, וְשָׁמְעָה, וְשָׁמַע, שְׁמִיעַת קִדְמִי -

GROUP E

The Targum renders - וישמעו - "And they hearkened" by - וקבילו מ'נה - "And they accepted it from him". Wherever the verb - שמע - means acceding to a person's instructions as here, and as GEN.28<sup>7</sup> -

ועקב - "And Jacob had hearkened to his father"; and EX.24<sup>7</sup> - נעשה ונשמע - "We will do and we will obey" - it is translated in the Targum by - קבל - "accepting". But whenever it merely means physically hearing with the ear, as in GEN.3<sup>8</sup> - ושמעו את קול ה' אל'הים - "And they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden" - Onkelos translates - ושמעו - "And they heard". Similarly GEN.27<sup>5</sup> - ור'קה שמעת - "And Rebecca heard" - by - ושמע ישראל; GEN.35<sup>22</sup> - "And Israel heard" - by - שמיע קדמי - EX.16<sup>12</sup> - "I have heard (שמעתי) the murmurings of the children of Israel" - by - "It was heard before Me".

Although Rashi is primarily a commentator on the Torah yet, quite often, he quotes Onkelos and explains his distinctions and his avoidance of the many anthropomorphisms<sup>9</sup> of the text.

5. EX.33<sup>9</sup> - ודבר ה' אל משה פנים אל פנים -

"And the Lord spoke to Moses face to face".

This expression may be felt to indicate a relationship between God and his creatures, and the direct

GROUP E

speech between Him and His mortal beings seems, somehow disrespectful to the Deity. Rashi, therefore, following the Targum has weakened the anthropomorphism considerably. **וידבר ה' אל משה - ומתמלל ע**

**משה שהוא כבוד שכינה -**

The verb - **ידבר** - according to the Targum, is in the Hithpael - **ומתמלל** - i.e. "He used to speak to Himself with (in the presence of) Moses - which is an expression of respect used with reference to the Shechinah". To avoid too intimate a relationship between God His mortal beings. Rashi goes further to illustrate his point: A similar expression is NUM.7<sup>89</sup> - **ושמע את הקול מדבר אלי** -

"Then he (Moses) heard the voice speaking to him".

The text does not read - **מדבר** - but - **מדבֵּר** - i.e. the (contracted) Hithpael form for - **מתדבר**.

Where the reading is - **מדבֵּר** - its interpretation is: The voice was <sup>10</sup> speaking to itself. <sup>11</sup> (i.e. it was not directed to any particular person) and the ordinary man naturally heard it. (Because he was there and he could not help hearing it). But when the text reads - **מדבֵּר** - it implies that the king was conversing with the ordinary man.

In EZEKIEL 2<sup>2</sup> - **ואשמע את מדבר אלי** - "And I heard him that uttered Himself (מדבר) unto me". Rashi



GROUP E

explains:- "מדבר במ'ר'יק - משמקו שהשכינה  
מדבר בפני עצמו בכבודו ושלוחיו ישמקו.

It implies that the Shechinah speaks independently,  
through the instrumentality of its Glory.<sup>12</sup>

GROUP FPrepositions Implying Motion or other Corporeality

A few examples on this subject will further illustrate how Onkelos and Rashi toned down the prepositions of the Hebrew text, which implied the corporeality of the Deity.

1. EX.19<sup>4</sup> - וּמָבִיא אֶתְכֶם אֵלַי - "And I brought you unto Myself". To avoid the anthropomorphism which the preposition - אֵלַי - "to Me" - implies. Rashi simply says:- בְּתַרְגּוּמוֹ - Explain this as the Targum does:- וְקִרְבִּית יִתְּכֹן לְפִנֵּי ה' - "And I have brought you near to My service". Although the verb - וּמָבִיא - makes it impossible completely to eliminate the idea of motion in the preposition, it can be played down to a point at which - אֵלַי - can be substituted by - לִי "to", i.e. for the sake of worship.<sup>1</sup>

2. EX.25<sup>2</sup> - וְקָחוּ לִי תְרוּמָה - that they take for Me an offering. The preposition - לִי - might be thought to imply corporeality of the Deity. Onkelos, therefore, avoids this by translating - וּפְרָטוֹן קִדְמִי - "that they set apart before Me a separated portion". Rashi, who remarked upon the anthropomorphism explains:- לְשֵׁמִי - לִי - "For Me" - means to the glory of My name.

GROUP F

3. Similarly - EX.25<sup>8</sup> - וַעֲשׂוּ לִי מִקְדָּשׁ "And let them make me a Sanctuary". Here, also, Onkelos translates the preposition - לִי - by - וַיַּעֲבִדוּן - "And let them make before Me a Sanctuary". Rashi, too, tones it down:- לִי - וַעֲשׂוּ -  
 לַעֲמִי בֵּית קֹדֶשׁ - "Let them make to the glory of My Name a place of holiness".
4. EX.29<sup>25</sup> - אֲשֶׁה הוּא לַה' - it is an offering made by fire for the Eternal.  
 The preposition - ל - is felt to be problematic.  
 Onkelos, therefore, tones it down - קִרְבַּנָּה הוּא קִדְשׁ ה' - It is a sacrifice before the Lord. Rashi, with his usual sensitivity, weakens the anthropomorphism by explaining - לַה' - לְשֵׁמוֹ שֶׁל מְקוֹם - To the Name of the Omnipresent.
5. EX.30<sup>37</sup> - וְהַקִּטְרֶת אֲשֶׁר תַּעֲשֶׂה... קִדְשׁ תִּהְיֶה לָךְ לַה' - "The incense prepared.....you shall treat it as holy to the Lord".  
 Here also the preposition - ל - "For the Lord" - is simply a degradation of God's honour, for it implies that God may need to use it. Onkelos, therefore, translates: - קֹדֶשׁ אֲתָהּ לָךְ קִדְשׁ ה' - it shall be unto thee holy before the Lord; thus distinguishing the nuances of the preposition in - לָךְ - and - לַה'.

GROUP F

Rashi weakens the anthropomorphism considerably

- לה' - שלא תעשה אלא לשמי - this means  
that you must not make it except in honour of My Name.

6. EX.31<sup>15</sup> - וביום העביץ שבת שבתון קדש לה' -  
"But on the seventh day there is a Sabbath of sacred  
rest, holy to the Lord".

Here, too, Onkelos explains the preposition ל' -

by - קדש קדש לה' - holiness before the Lord.

In other words the implication of the preposition  
that God needs the sanctity of the Sabbath is, of  
course, unfitting to the Deity. Therefore, Onkelos,  
tones it down by saying - קדש לה' - the holiness  
"before the Lord". Rashi also avoids the implication

- לה' - שמירת קדושתה לשמי ובמצותי  
The observance of its holiness shall be to the glory  
of My Name and by My command.<sup>2</sup>

7. LEV.3<sup>11</sup> - והקטירו הכהן המזבחה.. לחם אשה לה' -  
"The priest shall burn it at the altaras food offered  
to the Lord".

The implication that God needs the food of the  
offering is a gross anthropomorphism. Onkelos,  
therefore, translates - לחם קרבנא קדש לה' -

GROUP F

the food of the sacrifice (which is offered) before the Lord. Rashi, too, in a subtle way explains:-

— "It is the food of the fire in honour (in the Name) of the Lord".  
 — לחם אשה לה' - לחמו של אש לשם גבורה -

8. LEV.25<sup>2</sup> - ושביתה הארץ שבת לה' -

"....the land shall keep Sabbaths to the Lord".

If the preposition - ל' - is taken to indicate a "rest for the Lord" - i.e. that the Lord himself rests, then an anthropomorphism is involved - Onkelos, however, translates - שמיטתא קדש לה' - "the sabbatical year before the Lord". Rashi, on the other hand, gives a fine interpretation: לשם לה' - כשם שנאמר בשבת גמאש: עבית לה' - לשם לה' - This means a rest in honour (in the Name) of the Lord (in other words not a rest for the Lord). Rashi goes further to say that this should be compared to - עבית - to the weekly Sabbath (lit. the Sabbath of Creation) - EX.20<sup>10</sup> - where - עבית לה' - cannot mean "a day for God to rest"<sup>3</sup> - but rather a rest in honour of the Lord.

9. DEUT.13<sup>17</sup> - ושרפת באש... ואת כל עלולה כליל לה' -

"....and burn both city and goods as a complete offering to the Lord your God".

The preposition - ל' - may imply somehow, that God

GROUP F

requires the burning of the city for Himself.  
 Onkelos as usual weakens the anthropomorphism by  
 translating - קדש ה' - "Before the Lord". Rashi,  
 realising the implication of the text explains:-  
 לה' - לשמו ובשבילו - "For the honour of His  
 Name and for His sake".

In other words the burning of the city is purely for  
 the glorification of His Name.

Having mentioned a few examples, one can see that  
 Rashi's aim in emphasizing constantly the idea of  
 - לשמו - "for the honour of His Name" was purely  
 to avoid, or at the very least to weaken or disguise,  
 the anthropomorphisms implied by these prepositions.

10. NUM.3<sup>12</sup> - ואני הנה לקחתי את הלויים... תחת... והיו לי הלויים -  
 "I take the Levites for myself....as a substitute for  
 the eldest male child....the Levites shall be mine".  
 The anthropomorphism of the preposition - לי -  
 והיו לי - is blatant, and Onkelos avoids it by  
 translating - והיו משמעי קדמי לואי - "And  
 the Levites shall minister before Me".<sup>4</sup> Rashi  
 also gives the same interpretation. ואני מהיכן וכייתי.  
 בהן, מיתוך בני ישראל שיהיו ישראל שוכרי אורח  
 לשירות שלי? על ידי הבכורות... לפי שהיתה  
 העבודה בבכורות.

GROUP F

"On what grounds do I claim the right over the Levites, that the Israelites should have to hire them for my service"? It is through the firstborn....for originally the priestly functions were performed by the firstborn, etc.

11. NUM.16<sup>5</sup> - ... בקר וידע ה' את אשר לו ואת הקדוש והקריב אליו, ואת אשר יבחר בו יקריב אליו

"In the morning the Lord will show who are His and who is holy and will cause him to come near to Him; even him whom He may choose will He cause to come near unto Him".

The anthropomorphism which these prepositions - (אליו - and - לי) imply, are obvious. Onkelos, therefore, explains as follows:- "בצפרא ויהורע ה' ית דכשר ליה, וית דקריש וקרב לקדמוהי, וית ד יתרוי בה יקרב לשמושיה"

In the morning the Lord will make known who is fit to Him, and him who is holy and He will bring him near before Him; and him in whom He takes pleasure he will bring NEAR to serve Him.

Although Rashi's prime concern is to explain the repetitions of the verse which seem somehow, superfluous, yet at the same time, he quotes the Targum and avoids the anthropomorphism. Thus he

GROUP F

explains:- את אשר לו - לעבודת ליה, ואח הקדוש  
לכהונה... - והתרגום מוכיח בן ויקרב לקדמוהי  
יקרב לשמושיה -

Who are His - for the Levitical service; and him  
who is holy - for the priesthood. The Targum proves  
that this is so (i.e. that Scripture alludes to two  
different matters) for it renders the first phrase  
by "He will bring near before Him",<sup>5</sup> and the second  
by "He will bring near to His service".

- 12 GEN.24<sup>7</sup> - "And who  
spake unto me".

The direct speech between God and His mortal beings,  
which the preposition - לו - implies, is of course  
a gross anthropomorphism.<sup>6</sup> It is most interesting  
to know that while Onkelos translates literally:-

- ודימלל לי - Rashi, however, weakens the anthropo-  
morphism considerably and indirectly criticises

Onkelos for translating literally:- דבר לי - לצרכי

כמו אשר דבר עלי, וכן כל לי, ולו ולהם הסמוכים  
אצל דבור מפורשים בלשון על, ותרגום שלהם עלי,  
עליוהי, עליהון, שאין נוכל אצל דבור לשון לי, ולו, ולהם,  
אלא אלי אליו אליהם, ותרגום שלהם עמי עמיה  
עמיהון.



GROUP F

The word - לִי - means - "in my interest", just as (I KINGS II.4) "which He spoke concerning me". (עָלַי). In the same way, in every case where - לִי - or - לוֹ - or - לָהֶם - follow after the verb - דָּבַר - they must be explained in the sense of - עָלַי - "concerning" - and in the Targum they should be rendered by - עָלַי - "regarding me", or - עָלֵיהֶּ - "regarding him", or - עָלֵיהֶּן - "regarding them" - for with this verb - דָּבַר - in the sense of speaking to a person the preposition - לִי - and - לוֹ - and - לָהֶם - are not the appropriate ones, but rather - אֵלַי - and - אֵלָיו - and - אֵלֵיהֶּן -, and the renderings in the Targum should be by the preposition - עִמִּי - "to speak with" me and - עִמֵּיהֶּ - to speak with him, and - עִמֵּיהֶּן - to speak with them.<sup>7</sup>

As said above, although Rashi's prime concern here is to conform the Hebrew text with the rules of grammar, yet at the same time he avoids the anthropomorphism which these prepositions imply.

GROUP GIntermediary Elements

(or Divine Name elaborated or substituted).

The protection of the transcendence of the Deity by means of intermediate terms such as the Shechinah, the Memra, the Angel of the Lord or the Glory of the Lord is highly developed by the Targumim and especially by Onkelos. The development of these intermediaries were mainly due to the fact that the notion found in the Torah, of God dwelling in a certain place or God meeting with man is wholly unacceptable. Consequently the intermediaries were used by Onkelos to interpose between God and His interests in the world. It is not necessary for us to enter into the question of whether (and if so, to what extent) the Targumists and others who resorted to these intermediary terms really thought of them as constituting independent entities that could extend between man and God, or whether they used them merely as "surrogates"<sup>1</sup> - כִּנּוּיִם - in Hebrew, i.e. as substitute terms the use of which might seem somewhat less shocking in anthropomorphic contexts, inasmuch as they would disguise the reference of the unacceptable language to the Deity itself. The theological difficulty is not, of course, disposed of in this way; but it is rendered less immediately obvious, and the faith of ordinary readers would, it is apparently hoped, be less troubled by it. In the case of the insertion of - מַלְאָכִים -, an intermediary individual seems

GROUP G

clearly envisaged; but this need not apply to the other terms employed.

This subject has been discussed in the introduction of this section, as well as in Group A - Motion and Place denied God. We shall, therefore, confine ourselves here to a few examples, proving that Onkelos and Rashi have suppressed the gross anthropomorphisms of the Hebrew text by utilizing these intermediate terms.

1. GEN.32<sup>30</sup> - כי ראיתי אלהים פנים אל פנים - "For I have seen God face to face".

The idea of man seeing God is unacceptable and especially when the Torah itself says: EX.33<sup>23</sup> -

- ואני לא יראו - "But my face shall not be seen". - Onkelos, therefore, tones it down by interpreting - אני חזיתי מלאכה דה אפין באפין - "I have seen the Angel of the Lord face to face".

Rashi, too, in GEN.33<sup>10</sup> explains - פני אלהים - by - "the sight of the Angel".<sup>2</sup>

2. EX.29<sup>43</sup> - ונקדש בכבודי - "And it shall be sanctified by my glory".

The textual wording - ונקדש בכבודי - shows that the text itself is anti-anthropomorphic, Onkelos, therefore, translates it as it stands: - ונקדש ביקרי -

GROUP G

And it (i.e. the place) shall be sanctified by My Glory. Rashi goes further and explains that - *עַתָּה עֲרִיכָה שְׂכִינָתִי בּוֹ* - means - *כְּבוֹדִי* - that the Shechinah will rest therein.

3. Similarly NUM.14<sup>10</sup> *וַיֵּאמְרוּ כָל הָעָרָה... וַיִּכְבֹּד ה' נֹרָאָה בְּאַהֲלָהֶם* -

"....And the glory of the Eternal appeared in the appointed tent...."

Onkelos takes - *וַיִּקְרָא דַּה' אֶתְגַּלִּי* - by - *כְּבוֹד רַה'* -

"And the Glory of the Lord was revealed in the tent of meeting".

In other words even the "Glory" of the Lord was not "seen" as the text has it, but rather - *אֶתְגַּלִּי* - "revealed" - conceivably in a prophetic vision to the Israelites.

Perhaps, however, the expression - *אֶתְגַּלִּי* - is so common and automatic a targumic substitute for - *רָאָה* - that it may have been largely "blunted" into no more than a rather indirect way of saying "was seen".

However, be that as it may God himself was not seen, but rather the intermediate, the Glory was. Rashi goes further and explains that - *כְּבוֹד רַה'* - merely means - *הָעֵנָן יֵרֵד עִמּוֹ* - the intermediate, "the cloud" descended there.

In NUM.16<sup>19</sup> Rashi, once again, translates - *וַיִּרָא כְּבוֹד רַה'* - Onkelos, however, translates by - *בַּעֲמֹוד עָנָן* -

GROUP G

וְאֵתְּגִלִּי יִקְרָא דָּרָךְ. Most interesting to note that Ps. Jonathan<sup>3</sup> is in line with Rashi:-

וְאֵיִקְרַ שְׂכִינְתָּא אֲתֵגִלִּי בְּעֵנִי יִקְרָא.

4. EX. 29<sup>43</sup> - וְנִפְגַּשְׁתִּי שָׁמָּה לְבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל -

"I shall meet the Israelites there".

The expression - וְנִפְגַּשְׁתִּי - is certainly a gross anthropomorphism, Onkelos tones it down by explaining -

וְאִזְמִן מִימְרֵי - that it was the "Memra" which met the Israelites and not God. Rashi also conveys the

same principle - אֶתְּוַעֵד עִמָּם בְּדִבּוּר - "I will come together with them in a communication by speech.

In other words, the meeting will not be in its literal sense, God facing His subjects, but rather through the medium of - דִּבּוּר - "speech", or in Onkelos' words, the "Memra".<sup>4</sup>

5. EX. 33<sup>14</sup> - וְפָנַי יֵלְכוּ - "My face shall go with thee" (which is another way of saying I myself will go).

Here also Onkelos suppresses the anthropomorphism and explains that it is the intermediate, the

"Shechinah" - שְׂכִינְתִּי דְּרַחֲמֵי - who will go with the Israelites. Rashi follows Onkelos and says - כְּתִרְגּוּמוֹ - Understand this as the Targum renders it.<sup>5</sup>

GROUP G

6. EX.34<sup>9</sup> - יֵלֶךְ נָא ה' בְּקִרְבָּנוּ - "If I have indeed won thy favour, O Lord, then may the Lord go in our company".

Needless to emphasize that the verb - הֵלֵךְ - in this context is a gross anthropomorphism. Onkelos suppresses it: - תִּהְיֶה כַּעַן שְׂכִינָתָא דְה' בִּינָנָא - "Let, I pray, the Shechinah of the Lord go among us". In other words, Moses' request was simply that the intermediate of the Lord - "the Shechinah" - should go with them. Rashi follows the same principle that Moses' request was simply - שְׁלֵחַ מַעֲרֵה שְׂכִינָתֶךָ - שְׁלֵחַ מַעֲרֵה שְׂכִינָתֶךָ - that the intermediate "Shechinah" should be with Israel only, and not with other people.<sup>6</sup>

7. EX.13<sup>21</sup> - Sometimes, however, Rashi goes further than Onkelos in anti-anthropomorphic scruple, e.g. EX.13<sup>21</sup> - וְה' הוֹלֵךְ... בַּעֲמֹד עָנָן לְנִחֻתֵּם הַדֶּרֶךְ - "And the Lord went before them by day, a pillar of cloud to guide them on their journey". While Onkelos translates fairly closely: - וְה' מְדַבֵּר קְדָמֵיהוֹן בִּימָמָא - Rashi explains the text as follows: The - לְנִחֻתֵּם - of - לְ - is punctuated with "Patach", and it is like - לְהַנְחִיחָם - to make them be guided (infinitive Hiphil) by means of an agent - who is "the cloud of glory". In other words the guidance was made not by God Himself, but

GROUP G

rather by His intermediate - "the cloud of Glory".<sup>7</sup>

8. EX.4<sup>24</sup> - וַיִּפְגַּעֲהוּ רְיָאֵל [וְהוּא בִּדְרֶךְ בְּמַלְאָכִים]

...the Lord met him and sought to kill him".

The expression "The Lord met him" is disturbing.

Onkelos therefore tones it down by explaining that

Moses was met by the intermediate - "the Angel of

the Lord". - מַלְאָכָא דֵּה'. Rashi also follows

Onkelos and explains that it was "the Angel" of  
the Lord who became like a serpent and sought to

kill him.<sup>8</sup>

9. DEUT.4<sup>37</sup> - וְיָצֵאֲךָ בְּפָנָיו - "And brought thee out  
with His very presence". The word - בְּפָנָיו - is a naive  
conception unbecoming of the Deity. Consequently,  
Onkelos explains - וּמִפְקֵךְ בְּמִמְרָה - "And brought  
thee out with His Memra". Rashi following this  
principle explains that the word - בְּפָנָיו - refers  
to the intermediate the "Angel" of the Lord, who  
took them out of Egypt as it is said (EX.14<sup>19</sup>). The  
Angel of God, who had kept in front of the Israelites,  
moved away to the rear.<sup>9</sup>

GROUP HDirect and Indirect Softening  
(or Free Substitution)

In this chapter we shall deal with several examples in which Onkelos and Rashi have purposely toned down those expressions which somehow seem to disparage the majesty and honour of God. We shall deal with certain expressions of the Hebrew Bible which associate God with some physical or tangible object. We shall further examine in the next chapter Group I - certain expressions which appear to imply the admissability of polytheism.

1. GEN.33<sup>20</sup> - וַיִּצַב אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל  
"There he set up an altar and called it El Elohe Israel".

The expression associating God with the altar seems to discredit the honour of God. Onkelos, therefore, tones it down:

וַאֲקֵם תַּמֵּן מִדְּבַח וּפִלַח עֲלוּהֵי קִדְשׁ  
אֵל אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל -

"And he erected an altar and worshipped upon it before God, the God of Israel".

Rashi, in a notable way follows the same principle:

לֹא שֶׁהַמִּזְבֵּחַ קָרוֹי אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, אֲלֵא עַל שֶׁ שָׁהִיּה הַקִּבְיָה  
עָמָו וְהַצִּילוֹ קִוָּיָה שֶׁ הַמִּזְבֵּחַ עַל שֶׁ הֵנִס לְהִיּוֹת עֲבָדוֹ  
שֶׁל מָקוֹם נוֹכַח בְּקִרְיַת הַשֵּׁם וְכוּ' . . .

"It does not mean that the altar was named "The God of Israel", (thus bearing a Divine Name), but because the Holy One blessed be He, had been with



GROUP H

him and delivered him, he called the name of the altar by a term that had an allusion to the miracle, so that the praise of God might be recalled when people called it by its name.<sup>1</sup>

2. Similarly, EX.17<sup>15</sup> - וַיִּבְנוּ מֹשֶׁה מִזְבֵּחַ וַיִּקְרָא שְׁמוֹ ה' נִסִּי -  
 "Moses built an altar and named it "Hashem Nissi".  
 The word "Nissi," means "my banner" and so literally the name is "The Lord is my banner". Onkelos, however, cannot equate God with a banner, and accordingly renders:-  
 וּבְנָא מֹשֶׁה מִדְּבַחָא וּפְלַח עֲלוּהִי -

קִדְּשָׁהּ דַּעֲבָד לִיה נִסִּין -

"And Moses built an altar, and ministered upon it before the Lord who had wrought miracles<sup>2</sup> for him.<sup>3</sup>  
 Rashi also follows his explanation:- נִסִּי - הַקִּבֵּה עָשָׂה לָנוּ -  
 כֹּאֵן נִסִּי, לֹא שֶׁמִּזְבֵּחַ קָרוּ ה' אֱלֹהֵי הַמִּזְכֵּר שְׁמוֹ עַל מִזְבֵּחַ זִכְרֵנוּ אֵת הַנִּסִּי  
 שֶׁעָשָׂה הַמֶּלֶךְ -  
 The Holy One blessed be He, here performed a miracle for us. It does not mean that the altar was named "the Lord, my banner", but the reason for so calling it was that anyone mentioning the altar's name would thereby remember the miracle which the omnipresent had performed.

GROUP H

3. NUM.23<sup>22</sup> - אל מוציאם ממצרים בתועפות ראם לו.  
 "It was God that brought them out of Egypt, [ God ]  
 to whom [ belongs ] the strength (literally perhaps  
 uplift [ of the horns ] ) of a buffalo. Comparing God  
 to some feature that can stand for the strength of  
 that of a buffalo is, of course, disrespectful to the  
 Deity. Onkelos accordingly renders: - תקפא ורומא דיליה -  
 "The strength and height (echoing the root of - תועפות -  
 cf. - in Psalms 95<sup>4</sup>) are His".  
 Rashi also avoids the anthropomorphism - כתועפות - בתוקף -  
 "God brought them out of Egypt in accordance with the strength [ befitting ]  
 His sublimity and loftiness".<sup>4</sup>

4. NUM.12<sup>8</sup> - "In a plain vision and not in riddles".  
 The idea that Moses saw God is unsatisfactory whilst  
 Onkelos translates literally - בחזו ולא בקדן -  
 Rashi is at pains to exclude this - מראה - מראה זה -  
 מראה דבור, שאני מפרש לו דבורי במראית פנים שבו  
 ואני סותמו לו במידות וכו'... יכול מראה שכינה? תל  
 לא תוכל לראות את פני. -

When it says - מראה - this refers to the vivid  
 "appearance" of the Divine communication i.e. that  
 I enunciate my communication unto him in the  
 clearest form in which it can be put (literally

GROUP H

through visible appearance of the face ,i.e. aspect of meaning contained therein) and I do not obscure it in riddles etc. For, should one however, think that it refers to the "appearance of the Shechinah" (i.e. that he saw God) this is excluded by the text (EX.33<sup>20</sup>) - "My face you cannot see".

5. EX.34<sup>24</sup> - "When you go up these three times to enter the presence of the Lord your God".

The expression "seeing the face of the Lord" is a gross anthropomorphism. Onkelos, therefore, tones it down by saying - לֹא תִרְאֶה קֶדֶם ה' - "to be seen before the Lord". Rashi, also, interprets likewise:

"וְאַתָּה רָחוּק מִבֵּית הַבְּמִידָה וְאֵינְךָ יָכוֹל לִרְאוֹת לִפְנֵי תָמִיד"  
 "And you may be far from the Temple and you will then not be able to appear before Me continually". Rashi was careful to change the preposition, saying -

- לֹא תִרְאֶה לִפְנֵי - as against the textual expression<sup>5</sup>  
 - לִרְאוֹת אֶת פְּנֵי -

6. EX.16<sup>33</sup> - "וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה... קַח צִנְצָנֶת אֶחָד... וְהִנַּח אוֹתוֹ לִפְנֵי ה'"  
 "And Moses said...take a jar and put an "Omerful of Manna" therein and lay it up before the Lord".

The idea of putting the jar of manna next to God is

GROUP II

inappropriate. However, while Onkelos translates  
 - לפני ה' - literally - "before the  
 Lord", Rashi obviates this by explaining: לפני  
 הארון - "Before the Ark". In other words the jar  
 of manna should be next to the Ark in the Temple.  
 Thus Rashi weakened the anthropomorphism considerably.<sup>6</sup>

7. Similarly LEV.1<sup>5</sup> - ושחט את בן הבקר לפני ה' -  
 "And he shall slaughter the bull before the Lord etc.."  
 The idea of slaughtering the animal before the Lord  
 is certainly disturbing. Onkelos again translates  
 literally: - וינוס ית בר יורי קדם ה' -  
 לפני ה' - בעזרה -  
 "In the forecourt of the (Temple - here tacitly  
 identified with the - חצר - of the Tabernacle)  
 Tabernacle.
8. EX.33<sup>21</sup> - הנה מקום אתי ונצבת על הצור -  
 "Here is a place beside Me. Take your stand on the  
 rock".  
 The expression "there is a place beside Me" is  
 certainly a gross anthropomorphism for it implies  
 that God, like any other human being, can be  
 localised<sup>7</sup>. Onkelos translates - הא אתר מתקן -  
 - קדמי - "Behold there is a place prepared

GROUP H

before Me". Rashi has this to say:- "ומדרשו על"

מקום שהשכינה שם מדבר, ואומר המקום אתי ואינו אומר  
אני במקום, שהקב"ה מקומו על עולם ואין זולתו מקומו -  
A midrashic<sup>8</sup> explanation is that by the word - מקום -

Scripture is speaking of the place where the Shechinah is and that He, therefore said, "the place is beside Me", but that He did not say, "I am in the place": because the Holy One, blessed be He, is the place of the Universe (contains the Universe) but His Universe is not His place, (does not encompass Him). One can see how, with a marked theological sensitivity, Rashi has weakened the anthropomorphism considerably.

9. GEN.6<sup>2</sup> - ויראו בני האלהים את בנות האדם -

"And the sons of God saw the daughters of men etc..."

The expression "the sons of God" is unacceptable.

Consequently Onkelos interprets:- וימו בני רב רביא

"And the great men saw". Rashi, also, tones it down:-

- בני האלהים - בני הערים והשופטים -

"The sons of princes and rulers". In order to avoid any misunderstanding Rashi goes further and says:-

- כל אלהים שבמקרא לשון מרות וזה זכיה -

"Wherever the word - אלהים - occurs in the

Scriptures it signifies authority and the following passages prove this: (EX.4<sup>16</sup>) "And thou shalt be his

GROUP H

- אל-הים-master", and (EX.7<sup>1</sup>) "See I have made thee - אל-הים - a master". (See this section Group I notes 5 and 6).

10. GEN.7<sup>16</sup> - ויסגר ה' בעדו

"And the Lord closed the door on him".

The expression - ויסגר ה' - is a gross anthropomorphism. Onkelos tones it down:-

- ואגין ה' במימריה עלוהי. "And the Lord protected him by His word. Rashi follows Onkelos:-

- "He - ויסגר ה' - חגן עליו שלא שברוהו. (God) protected him so that they could not smash up the Ark".

11. EX.21<sup>6</sup> - והגיתו אדוני אל האלהים -

"Then his master shall bring him to God".<sup>9</sup>

The idea of bringing the slave to God is inappropriate.<sup>10</sup> Onkelos, therefore, tones it down

by explaining:- ויקרבנה רבוניה לקדש - דיניא -

"Then his master shall cause him to step before the judges". Rashi takes it in this sense:-

- האלהים - לבית דין -

GROUP H

12. Similarly EX.22<sup>7</sup> - ונקרב בעל הבית אל האלהים -

"But if the thief is not found, the owner of the house shall appear before God etc."

The expression "to appear before God" is, once again, unsatisfactory. Onkelos, therefore, explains -

- לקדם דיניא - that the matter must be settled before the "judges". Rashi, too, takes it in this sense:<sup>11</sup> - ונקרב אל הדיונין -

13. NUM.24<sup>6</sup> - כההרים נטע ה' - "like lign-aloes planted by the Lord".

The idea of God planting aromatic plants is certainly objectionable. However while Onkelos translates

literally - כבוסמיה דנציב ה' - Rashi palliates

this by explaining - נטע ה' - בגן עדן - "This plantation is in "Gan Eden". In other words it is

less problematical theologically to credit the Deity with sharing in this mystical and metaphorical "plantation".

14. DEUT.10<sup>9</sup> - על כן לא היה ללוי חלק ונחלה...ה' הוא נחלתו -

"Wherefore Levi hath no portion nor inheritance...the Lord is his inheritance...."

GROUP H

The idea that God is the inheritance of the Levites is certainly objectionable in that it appears to make God an inheritable chattel. Onkelos, therefore, tones it down:- **מתן דיהב ליה ה' אינון אחסנדיה**.

"The gifts (the dues from the sacrifices) which the Lord gave him are his inheritance".<sup>12</sup> Rashi follows Onkelos:- **ה' הוא נחלתו - נוטל פרוס**.

**מוזמן מבית המלך -**

"He (the tribe of Levite) receives his daily portion made ready for him from the King's house". In other words, in the Temple, he receives the dues from the sacrifices.



## GROUP I

References Exposed to Polytheistic Interpretation

1. GEN.3<sup>22</sup> -                      - הן האדם היה כאחד ממנו  
 "Behold, the man has become like one of us", etc.  
 The expression - כאחד ממנו - is certainly disturbing when we bear in mind that Judaism is at war against all polytheism and believes firmly in the idea of monotheism. Rashi, therefore, tones it down by explaining:-  
 כאחד ממנו - הרי הוא יחיד בתחתונים כמו שאני יחיד בעליונים, ומה היא יחידותו לדעת טוב ורע -  
 "He is unique among the terrestrial ones even as I am unique among the celestial ones. And his uniqueness consists of knowing good and evil etc". This interpretation is in accordance with Onkelos who translates:-  
 - הא אדם הוה יחיד בעלמא מינה  
 "Behold the man is become unique (alone) in the Universe:<sup>1</sup> it is from himself that he has to learn etc.
  
2. GEN.1<sup>26</sup> -                      - נעשה אדם בצלמנו כדמותינו  
 "We will make man in our image...."  
 Here also the expression - נעשה - in the plural form is certainly alarming. And it is most interesting to see that while Onkelos is literal, Rashi weakens this expression considerably:-  
 נעשה אדם - אף על פי שלא ס"עוהו ביצירתו, ויש מקום למינס לרדות לא נמנע הכתוב מללמד דרך ארץ

GROUP I

ומדת ענוה שיהא הגדול נמלך ונוטל רשות מן הקטן.  
ואם כתב אעשה אדם לא למדנו שיהא מדבר עם בית  
דינו אלא עם עצמו. ותשובת המינים כתב בצדו ויברא את  
האדם ולא כתב ויבראו.

Although no one assisted Him (God) in forming him (the man) and, although this use of the plural may give the heretics an occasion to rebel, yet the text is not inhibited from teaching proper conduct and the virtue of humility, namely, that the greater should consult and take permission from the lesser; for had it been written, I shall make man,<sup>2</sup> we could not then have learnt that God spoke to His judicial council, but to Himself only. And as a refutation to the heretics it is written immediately afterwards (verse 27) and "God created (אֱלֹהִים - singular) the man", and it is not written and "they created".

3. Similarly GEN.11<sup>7</sup> - הבה נרדה ונבלה שם שפתם - "Come, let us go down there and confuse their speech". The expression - נרדה - in the plural<sup>3</sup> is misleading and could give rise to the idea of polytheism. Onkelos translates closely: - הבו נתגלי ונבלבל רדמן<sup>4</sup> - "Come, we will be manifested<sup>4</sup> and will confuse their language there etc". Rashi, being aware of this difficulty gives the following explanation: - הבה נרדה - בבית דינו נמלך מענותותו יתירה

GROUP I

"He took counsel with His judicial Court because of His exceeding meekness". By this interpretation, Rashi avoided the idea of polytheism, remaining (apparently) blythely oblivious of the anthropomorphic element that he was himself introducing.

4. GEN.20<sup>13</sup> - וַיְהִי כַאֲשֶׁר הִתְעוּ אֱלֹהִים -  
 "When God set me wandering from my father's house".  
 The verb - הִתְעוּ - in the plural apparently denotes the concept of polytheism. (We may ignore the possibility that this is deliberate here: Abraham is speaking to Philistines, and may be represented as accomodating himself to the idiom which they would understand). To avoid this, Onkelos, translates:  
 - וְהוּא כִּי טָעוּ עַמִּי'א בְּתֵר עֹבְדֵי יְדִיהוֹן יִפִּי קְרִיבָה' לְדַמְלִתִּיהָ -  
 "And it was when the people erred after the works of their hands, that the Lord brought me near to the fear of Himself."<sup>5</sup>  
 In other words, the verb - הִתְעוּ - is not referring to God, but rather to the people worshipping idols. Rashi, who realised the difficulty offers two interpretations. a) - וְאוֹנֵקְלוֹס תִּרְגֵּם כֵּה שֶׁתִּרְגֵּם -  
 - that the verb - הִתְעוּ - can be explained as Onkelos does. b). - הִתְעוּ לְשׁוֹן רַבִּים, וְאֵל תִּתְּמָה כִּי הִרְבָּה מִקּוֹמוֹת -  
 לְשׁוֹן אֱלֹהִים וְלְשׁוֹן מִדּוֹת קִרְוֵי בִלְשׁוֹן רַבִּים -  
 The verb is in the plural, but do not be puzzled by

GROUP I

this for in many passages words denoting Godship or denoting authority are grammatically treated as plural,<sup>6</sup> e.g. - אשר הלכו - (II SAM.7<sup>23</sup>) "Whom God went to redeem". "A Holy God" (JOSH.24<sup>19</sup>) -  
 - כי אלהים קדושים -

5. EX.4<sup>16</sup> - ואתה תהיה לו לאלהים -

"And you will be the god he speaks for".

Taking the text in its literal sense, it means that Moses will be a god to Aaron. To avoid this misunderstanding, Onkelos explains: - ואת דררי -  
 - ליה לרב - "And you shall be to him as a Master".  
 Rashi follows Onkelos: - לאלהים - לרב ולשר -  
 "A superior and chief".

6. Similarly EX.7<sup>1</sup> - ראה נתתיך אלהים - "See I have made thee a god to Pharaoh".

The literal meaning of the text is objectionable. Onkelos, therefore, takes - אלהים - in the sense of - רב "Master". Rashi also takes it in the sense of - שופט ורודף - a judge and castigator. (cf. this section, Group H. note 9).

GROUP I

7. EX.20<sup>3</sup> - לא יהיה לך אלהים אחרים על פני -

"Thou shalt have no other gods before My face".

Rashi in a notable way displays a fine exegetical

feeling: - אלהים אחרים - שאינן אלוהות, אלא אחרים -

עשאוּם אלהים עליהם, ולא יתכן לפרשו אלהים

אחרים וזוּלתי שגנאי כלפי מעלה לקראותם

אלוהות אצלו -

Other gods - which are not in fact gods, but others have made them gods over themselves (i.e. gods of others). It would not be correct to explain this to mean "gods other than Me", for it would be blasphemy of the Most High God to term them gods together with Him. In this comment, Rashi diverges from Onkelos (without quoting him) who actually explains it in this manner. - לא יהי לך אלה אחרן בר מני -  
 "Thou shalt have no other god except Me". But Rashi goes further as he regards Onkelos' interpretation (which he must of course have known) to be blasphemy to the Most High God.<sup>7</sup>

8. DEUT.32<sup>17</sup> - יזבחו לעֲדִים לא אלה - "They sacrificed unto demons, no gods, gods that they knew not".

Although the text rejects the worship of the demons as gods, nevertheless the mere fact of calling them gods before the Most High God is certainly objectionable. Rashi, therefore, who realises this

implication comments: לא אלה - כתרומו דלית בהון צרוך.

GROUP I

Understand this as the Targum does: They sacrifice unto demons which serve no useful purpose for if they were at least any usefulness in them to the world(as e.g. in the sun, the moon and stars) the provocation to anger would not be so intense.<sup>8</sup> In other words, as the demons are of no advantage to the world, they cannot be termed as gods.

In these few examples one can see how Onkelos and Rashi have excluded opportunities for saddling the biblical text with polytheistic interpretations.

SUMMARY

In conclusion, one can see from the above classified chapters how Onkelos followed by Rashi have purposely toned down these conceptions which somehow seem to disparage the honour of God. We may say that on the whole, Rashi is also concerned to eliminate possibilities of anthropomorphic interpretation and throughout his commentary his tendency is to remove any action connected with God which might lower his dignity or degrade his character, even if in his anxiety to get rid of the obvious anthropomorphism he sometimes offers exegesis implying, albeit less starkly, anthropomorphism or anthropopathism of another kind.

GROUP I

We have seen also how he endeavours to avoid or moderate many of the representations or conceptions of the human qualities and emotions attributed to the Deity in the Old Testament.

Rashi further denied God all attributes of human form, motion, passions and the like.

In short, although Rashi was imbued with knowledge of the Halacha and midrashic patterns of thought which were the presupposed in the education and literature of his generation, yet he did not fail to remark on the many instances of anthropomorphisms of the Hebrew text and Onkelos' subtlety in disposing of them exegetically.

We may therefore conclude that in this field as well as in other fields, Onkelos was certainly a guide and a teacher to Rashi. We may even say that in some areas, as has been proven, the disciple improved upon his master's examples.

Reverence to God

We have shown in previous chapters (those on Anthropomorphism) how Onkelos suppressed or moderated many of the anthropomorphisms and apparently naive conceptions of God in the Hebrew Scriptures. In particular, Onkelos substituted positive statements in the place of rhetorical questions found in the Torah. Most probably this was due to the fact that some rhetorical questions could by their very formulation admit the possibility of doubt about the ability of God in executing His will, or in meting out justice to His subjects on earth. Other rhetorical questions as they stand, might seem to cast doubts about the whole concept of monotheism which is fundamental to Judaism...

Without further elaboration we shall now proceed to give a few examples in order to illustrate these points.

1. GEN.18<sup>25</sup> - הַשּׁוֹפֵט כָּל הָאָרֶץ לֹא יַעֲשֶׂה מִצְדָּקָה.  
 "Shall not the judge of all the earth do what is just? The question could imply that God does not mete out justice to His creatures. As this is a blasphemy Onkelos, therefore, couched it in a positive way.... דִּין כָּל אֶרֶץ בְּרַחֲמֵי יְעֹבֵד דִּינָא -  
 "He who judges all the earth will surely do justice".<sup>1</sup>



2. EX.15<sup>11</sup> - מי כמוכה באלים ר' -  
 "Who is like thee, O Lord, among the gods".<sup>2</sup>

Although it is a rhetorical question, nevertheless the text implies the possibility that there is more than one God,<sup>3</sup> consequently Onkelos tones it down by couching it into a positive statement -

- לית בר מינך לאת הוא אלהא דה' -  
 "There is none beside thee, for thou art the God, O Lord."<sup>4</sup>

3. NUM.23<sup>19</sup> - יהוא אמר ולא יעשה ודבר ולא יקימנה -  
 "Hath He said, and shall He not do it? Or hath He spoken, and shall He not establish it?"<sup>5</sup>

The rhetorical question as it stands could cast doubts on God's ability in executing His will.

Consequently Onkelos substitutes it into a positive statement:-  
 - יהוא אמר ועבד, וכל מימריה מתקיים -  
 "What He hath said He will perform, and His every word is steadfast".<sup>6</sup>

4. DEUT.3<sup>24</sup> - אשר מי אל בשמים ובארץ אשר יעשה כמעשיך -  
 "What god is there in heaven or on earth who can match thy works and mighty deeds"?

Here, too, because of its implication, Onkelos turned it into a positive statement:-  
 "ראת הוא אלהא -  
 דשכינתך בשמיא מלעילא ושליט בארעא ולית די יעבד  
 כעובדך וכגוברתך . . . ."

"For thou art God, whose Shechinah is in the heavens above, and thou rulest in the earth, and none can do according to thy works, or according to thy might".

Rashi, however, in all these cases does not seem to be concerned with the implication that these rhetorical questions pose and in most of them Rashi simply says:- לשון תמיה - "The words express a question".<sup>7</sup> Perhaps, however, what Rashi means by - לשון תמיה - is - "This is a [rhetorical] question"; and he expresses it in this way, due to lack of brief terminology in Hebrew for "rhetorical".

However, in other instances where the biblical phrases seem to impugn the majesty of God or to degrade His character Rashi followed Onkelos, and both endeavoured to tone down the meaning of the biblical text, thus avoiding any adverse implications. Here are a few examples to illustrate this point.

5. GEN.20<sup>13</sup> - ו'הי כאשר התעו אותי אלהים - "When God set me wandering from my father's house etc...." In addition to the unusual plural (התעו) as used with אלהים - when this is קדש - the idea that God caused Abraham to err is somehow a degradation of God's character. Onkelos, therefore,

- והיה כד נעו עממיה בחר עובדי' -  
 ידה יתי קריב ה' לדחלתיה -

"And it was, when the people erred after the works of their hands, the Lord did bring me near to the fear of Himself, etc"...In other words, it was the people who have erred after their idols, but Abraham was brought near to the worship of the true God. Rashi, who was fully aware of the implication of the text comments:- ואונקלוס תרגם מה שתרגם - "Onkelos translates it in his own way". In other words the theological difficulty can be circumvented in the light of Onkelos' interpretation.<sup>8</sup>

6. GEN.21<sup>6</sup> - ותאמר שרה צחוק עשה לי אלהים -  
 And Sarah said "God hath made me a person to be laughed at<sup>9</sup>....." This expression as it stands, could certainly raise curious speculations regarding God's character. Onkelos, therefore, takes the word - צחוק - (laugh) to mean - חדוד -  
 - ואמרת שרה חדוד עבד לי ה' כל דשמך יחד לי... - joy:-  
 "And Sarah said the Lord hath made me to have gladness; everyone who heareth will rejoice at my [ fortune" ].<sup>10</sup>

Rashi also takes it in this sense:- יצחק לי - ישמח לי -  
 It means whoever hears it will rejoice on my account.

In the same way the N.E.B. translates:- "God has given me good reason to laugh, and everybody who hears will laugh with me".

- Sometimes, however, while Onkelos translates literally, Rashi goes further and removes all sorts of improprieties which could be imputed to God's character. - e.g. EX.21<sup>12-13</sup> - "מכה א'ע ומת" מות יומת - ואשר לא צדה והאלהים אנה לידן... "Whoever strikes another man and kills him shall be put to death. But if he did not act with intent, but they met by act of God, etc...."

The question, however, arises if the man did not premeditate the blow why should this be brought about by God? While Onkelos translates literally<sup>11</sup>:- "ול' לא כמן ל'ה ומן קדם ה' את מסר לידה ואשן לך... -- "But he was delivered into his hand from before the Lord", - Rashi explains the cause and reason, and thus avoids any possible maligning of God's character - "Scripture, here is speaking of two men, one of whom killed a person with premeditation and the other killed inadvertently, and in neither case were there witnesses to testify about the matter. Consequently, the former was not put to death and the latter was not forced to go to a city of refuge (cf. NUM.35<sup>11</sup>). Now God brings them together to the same inn (פונדק - lodging

place). He who killed with premeditation happens to sit beneath a ladder, and the other who killed inadvertently ascends the ladder and falls, [when descending it<sup>12</sup>], upon the man who killed with premeditation and kills him. Witnesses now being present they testify against him, so compelling him to be banished to one of the cities of refuge. The result is that he who killed inadvertently is actually banished and he who killed with premeditation actually suffers death".<sup>13</sup> This rehearsal by Rashi of the hypothetical elaboration of this text as treated in his Rabbinic sources is simply to avoid all theological awkwardness which might arise from the scriptural text regarding apparently arbitrary action on the part of God.

8. In EX.15<sup>7</sup> - תהרס קמך - "Thou hast overthrown them that rose up against thee". To say that God has enemies sounds disrespectful. Onkelos, therefore, paraphrases the text:- ובסג' תקפך  
 תבררננון לוקמו על עמך -  
 "And in the greatness of thy might thou hast broken down those who rose against thy people". Rashi in the name of the Mechilta makes it clear that the enemies of Israel are considered God's enemies.<sup>14</sup>  
 "ומי הם הקמים נגדו אלו הקמים על ישראל -

9. LEV.24<sup>11</sup> - ויקב בן האשה הישראלית את השם ויקלל -

"He the Israelite woman's son uttered the Holy Name in blasphemy".

Onkelos does not translate: - ויקלל - by

- וקלל - (cf. EX.21<sup>17</sup>) but rather - וארגז -  
and angered.<sup>15</sup>

# INTRODUCTION

## Veneration of the Patriarchs and their Descendants

Onkelos displays great respect for the Patriarchs and Matriarchs and where the biblical phrases reveal them in an untoward light, Onkelos suppresses the literal meaning and substitutes an alternative phrase or word, thus avoiding any adverse implications.

Without further elaboration the following verses illustrate this point:-

1. In GEN.31<sup>30</sup> - וַעֲתָה הֲלֹךְ הָלַכְתָּ... לָמָּה גִנַּבְתָּ אֶת אֱלֹהֵי -  
"I know that you went away...but why did you steal my gods?"

On the word - גִּנַּבְתָּ - "stolen", Onkelos did not translate literally as this would be a disrespect to the Patriarch Jacob, making him into a common thief, he therefore suppressed the literal meaning and instead translated it by - לָמָּה נִסְבֵּרְתָּ יֵת דְּחִלְתֵּי - why have you taken<sup>1</sup> my god?

2. Similarly in GEN.31<sup>26-27</sup> - The phrase - וַתִּגְנַב אֶת לִבִּי -  
"that thou hast stolen away my heart, and (v.27)  
- וַתִּגְנַב אֹרְצִי - "and steal away from me", idiomatic expressions for, to take advantage of a person's ignorance (of דַּעְתֵּי - גִּנַּב) are once again toned down by Onkelos and in both cases he translates - (v.26)  
- "וַאֲמַר לָבֵן לְעֵקֶב מָה עָבִידְתָּ וְנִסְבֵּרְתָּ מִנִּי."  
And Laban said to Jacob what have you done that you

INTRODUCTION

have concealed from me. In v.27 - וַיִּכְתֹּב אֶל-רָחֵל -  
 is translated by - וּכְסִיתָא כְּנִי -and did  
 hide<sup>2</sup>[it] from me.<sup>3</sup>

3. Also in verse 32 - on the phrase - וְלֹא יָדַע יַעֲקֹב כִּי -  
 - רָחֵל גִּנְבָהּ - "And Jacob knew not that Rachel had  
 stolen them".  
 Onkelos translates - וְלֹא יָדַע יַעֲקֹב אֲרִי רָחֵל נְסִיבְתָּהוֹן -  
 "And Jacob knew not that Rachel took them" (The Taraphim).  
 Once again to save the honour of Rachel, Onkelos evinces  
 a subtle nicety of expression.

4. In GEN.32<sup>21</sup> - וַיִּבְרַח - "And he (Jacob) ran away with  
 all that he had etc..."  
 The equivalent Aramaic word for - וַיִּבְרַח -  
 is - וַעֲרָק -and he fled, but once again to  
 protect Jacob from possible imputations<sup>4</sup> of cowardice,  
 Onkelos translates - וַאֲוָל - and he went.<sup>5</sup>

Having illustrated with a few examples Onkelos' method  
 of reverence to the Patriarchs and their wives, we may  
 say that in general Rashi follows Onkelos' method.  
 Before setting out the details of Rashi's attitude  
 towards Onkelos in this connection, a division of the  
 main points in this area may facilitate comprehension



INTRODUCTION

of Rashi's utilization of Onkelos' comments.

The Groups are as follows:-

Group A. Veneration and Idealization of the Patriarchs  
and their Wives.

Group B. Veneration and Idealization of the Patriarch's  
Sons.

Group C. Veneration and Idealization of the Prophet Moses.

Group D. Veneration and Idealization of Aaron, the Priests,  
The Elders of Israel and the People of Israel.

GROUP AVeneration and Idealization of the Patriarchs and  
their Wives.

1. GEN.31<sup>19</sup> - ותגנב רחל את התרפים - "And Rachel stole the Teraphim" - Rashi says, "her intention was to wean her father (Laban) from idol worship".<sup>1</sup>

Although Rashi has not suppressed the literal meaning of the word - גנב - as Onkelos did, yet the reader can see that Rashi in his own way endeavoured also to play down the "sin of theft" and he, therefore, toned it down by the fact that Rachel's intention was for the good.

2. In GEN.26<sup>10</sup> - ויאמר אבימלך... כמעט שכב אחד העם - "And Abimelech said, why have you treated us like this? One of the people might easily have gone to bed with your wife and then you would have made us liable to retribution".

On the words - אחד העם - Onkelos translates - למיחד - "the one singled out from the people". In other words, not just an ordinary person for such casual availability would imply disrespect to the Matriarch Rebekah, Onkelos, therefore, takes - אחד - in the sense of - מיוחד - "special one". Rashi follows his interpretation exactly - אחד העם - המיוחד בעם, וזה המלך - and explains that this means the "singular", i.e. pre-eminent individual of the population viz., the "king".<sup>2</sup>

GROUP A

3. GEN.30<sup>8</sup> - "וַתֹּאמֶר רָחֵל... נִפְתְּלֹתַי עִם אֱמוּנָתִי גַם יִכְרְלֶנָּה" -

"And Rachel said, wrestlings of God have wrestled with my sister....and she called his name Naphtali".<sup>3</sup>

Onkelos, quoted by Rashi,<sup>4</sup> does not render - נִפְתְּלֹתַי - in the sense of "wrestling", for this might give rise to the misapprehension that the sisters were actually fighting one another. He, therefore, takes it in the sense of - תַּפְלָה - "prayer". Thus, once again by suppressing the literal meaning, Onkelos and Rashi have protected the honour of the Matriarchs.<sup>5</sup>

4. GEN.25<sup>27a</sup> - "וַיִּגְדְּלוּ הַנְּעָרִים... וַיַּעֲקֹב אִישׁ תֵּשֵׁב אוֹהֶלִים" -

"The boys grew up... but Jacob led a settled life and stayed among the tents".

Onkelos refuses to accept that Jacob was just a "plain man" (תֵּשֵׁב - unimpaired, i.e. of unimpaired integrity; but in Rabbinic Hebrew - תֵּשֵׁב - simple, unintellectual), who abides in tents, like nomads and shepherds who tender their flock. Therefore, to save Jacob's intellectual credit, Onkelos takes - תֵּשֵׁב - in the sense of - גִּבּוֹר שְׁלֵמִים - a complete (perfect) man. Rashi, once again, follows his method and thus he says - תֵּשֵׁב - means - כָּל בּוֹכֵן פִּי - "as his heart so was his mouth" - in other words, his thoughts and his words tallied, as they ought to, in a "perfect man".

GROUP A

5. GEN.25<sup>27b</sup> - With regard to - יושב אורלים - Onkelos portrays the great delight of Jacob in studying Torah and he therefore interprets - יושב אורליים - not in its literal sense but rather - מעמט בבית אורלפנא - "And Jacob ministering in the house of instruction". Rashi<sup>6</sup> also follows this interpretation and says that the Patriarch was studying in the schools of Shem and Eber.<sup>7</sup>
6. GEN.27<sup>35</sup> - ויאמר בא אחיך במרמה - "And he said your brother came treacherously and took away your blessing". Out of respect for Jacob, Onkelos followed by Rashi (without quoting his name) declined to take the word - במרמה - in the sense of "deceitfulness",<sup>8</sup> - and they, therefore, translated it in the sense of - חכמה - "cleverness" and subtlety.<sup>9</sup>
7. GEN.29<sup>17</sup> - ועיני לאה רכות - Leah was dull-eyed<sup>10</sup> (רך - tender). Out of consideration for the image of Leah, Onkelos refuses to accept that Leah was "dull-eyed", and he therefore explains - רכות - by - יפה - "beautiful". Rashi who does not seem to suppress the literal meaning of the word - רכות - (רך - tender)

GROUP A

nevertheless palliates it by adding that Leah's eyes were tender because "she thought she would have to fall to the lot of Esau and she therefore wept continually, because everyone said, Rebekah has two sons, Laban has two daughters - the elder daughter <sup>for</sup> the elder son, the youngest daughter for the younger son".<sup>11</sup>

8. GEN.27<sup>19</sup> - וַיֹּאמֶר יַעֲקֹב... אֲנִי עֵשָׂו בְּכֹרִךְ -  
 "Jacob answered his father, I am Esau, your elder son".  
 Rashi who refuses to believe that the Patriarch Jacob deceived his father and told a lie, suppresses the obvious literal meaning of the text by dividing it and interprets - אֲנִי עֵשָׂו בְּכֹרִךְ - "I am" he [that brings food to you], and Esau is your first born".<sup>12</sup>

In verse 24 - when his father Isaac asked him (Jacob) again, "Are you really my son Esau?" Jacob replied - אֲנִי - "I am". It is unequivocally clear from his answer that Jacob lied to his father. And yet, Rashi, once again refuses to accept this, and he therefore comments - לֹא אָמַר אֲנִי עֵשָׂו אֶל־אָבִי - he did not say "I am Esau" - but "It is I".

The reader can see that Rashi was compelled to do so as he could not acknowledge the possibility that the Patriarch Jacob would tell a lie. Ps. Jonathan and

GROUP A

Onkelos,<sup>13</sup> however, showed no concern for this and translated the text literally.

In other instances, however, while Rashi shows no concern and does not comment on the text, Onkelos to save the Matriarch's honour, paraphrases the biblical remarks which appear to cast a shadow on it.

9. GEN.27<sup>13</sup> - ותאמר לו אמו עלי קללתך בני  
 "His mother answered him, let the curse fall on me my son etc..."

Onkelos interprets as follows:- ואמרת ליה אימיה -  
 עלי אתאמר בנבואה לא יתון לוטיא עלך ברי,  
 ברה קבל מינ ואיול סב לי -

"And his mother said to him, Unto me it hath been said in prophecy, that there shall be no curses upon thee, my son; only obey me, and go and take for me".

Onkelos refuses to accept the possibility that the curses would accrue to the Matriarch Rebekah. It is also unacceptable to say that Jacob was satisfied and ready to meet his father Isaac, once his mother accepted upon herself any curse which Isaac might pronounce; for if that were the case then it would imply a complete disrespect to his mother, and Jacob would have transgressed one of the ten commandments - "Honour your Father and Mother" (EX.20<sup>12</sup>; DEUT.5<sup>16</sup>).

GROUP A

Onkelos, being confronted with this difficulty, paraphrases the text<sup>14</sup> out of consideration for Rebekah and Jacob, and thus he separates the word - קללך - "your curse" from the word - עלי - "upon me". And to fill up the gap he adds that - עלי אתאמר בנבואה - "unto me it hath been said in prophecy that there shall be no curses upon thee my son".<sup>15</sup> There is, however, no comment on this verse on the part of Rashi.

10. GEN.31<sup>39</sup> שרפה לא הבאתי לך...גנבותי וסוגנותי לילה  
 "I have never brought to you the body of any animal... you claimed compensation from me for anything stolen by day or by night".  
 The suffix of - גנבותי - is not the first person singular possessive, but the "hireq compaginis".<sup>16</sup>  
 It appears that Onkelos declined to translate - גנבותי - literally "my theft" because the similarity of - גנבותי - to - גנבתי - might give rise to the misconception that the Patriarch stole from Laban. He therefore subtly translates it by - נִקְיִיתִי - "I kept",<sup>17</sup> which is in fact the meaning implicit in the context. Rashi, too, although he is not worried about the wording of the text, in his own way, tries to defend the Patriarch by saying that

GROUP A

"everything I paid back whether, that which was stolen by day or, that which was stolen by night".<sup>18</sup>

In several instances, Onkelos, followed by Rashi, in his textual interpretations understands the good characteristics of the Patriarchs and Matriarchs and emphasises their moral worth. Also both Onkelos and Rashi make prominent the Patriarch's great delight in the study of the Torah, the fear of God, and the worship of the God they have discovered. Here are a few examples to illustrate these points.

11. GEN.24<sup>67</sup> - וַיְבִיחַ יִצְחָק הָאֵלֶּהּ שָׂרָה אִמּוֹ  
 "And Isaac brought her into his mother Sarah's tent...."  
 Onkelos gratuitously introduces references to the noble ways of Sarah:- וַאֲעֵלָה יִצְחָק לְמִשְׁכְּנָהּ וְהָאָהָרָה  
 תִּקְנִין עֹבְדֵיהָ כְּעֹבְדֵי שָׂרָה אִמִּיהָ -  
 "And Isaac brought her to the tent, and he saw that her deeds were upright as the deeds of Sarah his mother"..... Rashi,<sup>19</sup> who follows Onkelos elaborates on this subject and thus he explains: while Sarah was living a light had been burning in the tent from one Sabbath eve to the next, there was always a blessing in the dough and a cloud of glory was always hanging over the tent as a divine protection".



GROUP A

12. GEN.18<sup>8</sup> - והוא עומד עליהם תחת העץ ויאכלו -  
 "....And waited on them himself under the tree while they ate".  
 Onkelos interprets - עומד - by - משמש - "And he (Abraham) served them". Although Abraham thought that the three Angels were merely Arabs,<sup>20</sup> worshipping idols, yet he himself served them and came to their aid. Rashi does not comment on the word - עומד - and we can assume that he follows the interpretation of Onkelos as the latter interpretation is self evident from the context itself by its combination - עומד עליהם - = stand in attendance upon.

13. GEN.12<sup>5</sup> - ואת כל רכושם אשר רכשו ואת הנפש אשר עשו בחרן -  
 And Abraham took Sarai.....all the property they had collected, and the dependants they had acquired in Haran....."  
 Onkelos explains - וית נפשותא ושעבדו לאורייתא - by - הנפש -  
 "And the souls whom they had made subject to the law".  
 Rashi<sup>21</sup> also emphasises their missionary endeavours by saying that Abraham and Sarah brought the "souls of Haran" beneath the sheltering wings of the Shechinah, and converted them to recognise the true God.

GROUP A

14. GEN.24<sup>63</sup> - ויצא יצחק לשוח בשדה -

"And Isaac went out to meditate<sup>22</sup>..."

Onkelos takes - לשוח בשדה - to mean - לצללה - to pray.

Rashi also takes it in this sense.<sup>23</sup>

15. GEN.48<sup>22</sup> - ואני נתתי לך... מיד האמורי במרבי ובקשרי -

"I have given to thee...with my sword and with my bow".

Onkelos renders - בצלורי - במרבי ובקשרי -

- with my prayer and with my supplication. Rashi

also explains likewise - היא חכמתו ותפלתו - "his (Jacob)

wisdom and his prayer".<sup>24</sup> According to Onkelos and

Rashi, the Patriarchs were not warmongers who relied on

their physical strength but rather on their spiritual

weapons. In other words in prayer and supplication to

God to save them from all troubles.

## GROUP B

Veneration and Idealization of the Patriarch's Sons

1. GEN.34<sup>13</sup> - וַיֹּצִיאוּ בְנֵי יַעֲקֹב אֶת שָׂכָר וְאֶת חָמוֹר אֲבוֹיָם בְּמַרְמָה -  
 "Jacob's sons gave a dishonest<sup>1</sup> reply to Shechem and his father Hamor...."

Replying to Shechem with dishonesty is certainly difficult to reconcile with the ethics ideally pre-supposed in the Patriarch's sons. Consequently Onkelos tones it down by translating: - וְאֲחֵיבּוֹ בְּנֵי יַעֲקֹב וְשָׂכָר וְחָמוֹר אֲבוֹהֵי בְּחִכְמָה -

"And the sons of Jacob answered Shechem and Hamor his father with subtlety<sup>2</sup> etc".

Rashi, without quoting Onkelos, explains likewise: - בְּמַרְמָה - בְּחִכְמָה. Thus, Rashi too protects the reputation of Jacob's sons by saying that "Scripture says that there was no deception (מַרְמָה) in this because he had defiled Dinah their sister".<sup>3</sup>

2. GEN.38<sup>2</sup> - וַיֵּרָא עֹשֶׂה יְהוּדָה בֵּת אִשָּׁה כְּנַעֲנִי -  
 "And Judah saw there a daughter of a Canaanite man whose name was Shua etc..."

Rashi who follows Onkelos' interpretation renders the word - כְּנַעֲנִי - by - תַּגְרָא - "merchant".

One can justify their interpretation only by assuming their similarity with the tradition, later embodied in Nahmanides's<sup>4</sup> comment, that the Patriarchs and their sons were instructed not to intermarry with Canaanite

GROUP B

women.<sup>5</sup> It is, therefore, almost impossible to contemplate that Judah transgressed this principle accepted among his family. Consequently out of consideration for Judah's honour Onkelos and Rashi suppressed the literal meaning of the text, and translated the word - כַּנְעָנִי - by "merchant". Sometimes in places where Onkelos translates literally, Rashi works independently and tries to save the

3. reputation of the Patriarchs' sons. Thus in GEN.35<sup>22</sup> -

- וַיְהִי בְעֵתֵן יִשְׂרָאֵל... וַיֵּלֶךְ רְאוּבֵן וַיִּשְׁכַּב אֵת בִּלְהָה -

"While Israel was living in that district, Reuben went and lay with his father's concubine Bilhah etc."

Although the biblical text says clearly - וַיִּשְׁכַּב -

"And he lay"<sup>6</sup> - Rashi, to save Reuben's honour, suppresses the literal meaning of the text and comments that "because he had disturbed Jacob's couch, Scripture accounts it to him as though he had actually sinned in this manner. But why did he disturb his couch?

When Rachel died Jacob removed his bed, which was always in Rachel's tent and put it in Bilhah's tent. Reuben came and protested against the slight this inflicted on his mother (Leah). He said: if my mother's sister was her rival is that any reason why the handmaid of my mother's sister (Bilhah) should become a rival to her? On this account, therefore, he disturbed the couch".<sup>7</sup>

GROUP B

On the other hand, it is interesting to note that while the Targumim<sup>8</sup> follow the midrashic interpretation of the Rabbis, Onkelos<sup>9</sup> renders - ו'שכב - literally - ואול ראובן ושכב עם בלהה - "And Reuben went and slept with Bilhah".

4. GEN.39<sup>11</sup> - ויהי כהגזם...ויבא הביתה לעשות מלאכתו - "One day he came into the house as usual to do his work etc."

Rab and Shemuel in Bab. Tal. Sot.37<sup>b</sup> differ as to what - לעשות מלאכתו - "to do his work" - means.

Rab holds: - מלאכתו מעש - his actual housework; the other says that it means to associate with her, but a vision of his father's face appeared to him and Joseph resisted temptation and did not sin.<sup>10</sup>

Onkelos, faithful to his principle of saving the reputation of the Patriarchs and their sons, chose the opinion of the one who says that Joseph came to do his actual "housework". Thus he interprets - והוא ביוםא הדין ועל לביתא למבדק בכתביה חושבניה - "And it was on this day that he came into the house to examine the records of his accounts, etc". Rashi<sup>11</sup>, however, although he quoted the two different opinions of Rab and Shemuel, nevertheless, unlike Onkelos, he did not see the purpose of deciding on which view

GROUP B

to accept, as, at any rate, Joseph's honour is saved, for both Rabbis agree that as Scripture made clear, he did not sin.

5. GEN.42<sup>7</sup> - וַיִּתְנַכֵּר אֵלֵיהֶם - "And when [Joseph] saw his brothers, he recognised them but pretended not to know them etc."  
 Rashi explains - וַיִּתְנַכֵּר - "He made himself like a - נִכְרִי - stranger to them in his conversation, speaking harshly."<sup>12</sup> Onkelos, on the other hand, refused to say that Joseph behaved like a stranger to his brethren, and he therefore translates - וְחָשַׁב מַה דְּמַלִּיל לֵיהֶוּן - "And considered what he should say to them".
6. Similarly, GEN.37<sup>18</sup> - וַיִּתְנַכְלוּ אוֹרְחוֹ לְרַחֲמֵהוּ - "They plotted to kill him".  
 Rashi whose main concern is the etymology of words explains: - וַיִּתְנַכְלוּ - "They (the brothers) were filled with plots and craft".<sup>13</sup> Onkelos on the other hand, who is not so particular about the etymology of the textual words, but keeps rather to the subject matter,<sup>14</sup> translates in both places - וְחָשַׁב - .  
 And "he considered" - and - וְחָשַׁב - "they considered" -respectively. The reader can see that Onkelos refuses to accept that Joseph was like "a stranger" to his

GROUP B

brothers, nor for that matter that the brothers who were righteous people, conspired to kill him. Onkelos, therefore, comes to their defence, and saves their reputation by toning down the Hebrew text which seems to reflect on their character.

On the other hand, when the text speaks about the Heathen, Onkelos does not come to their defence and

7. translates the text as it stands, e.g. NUM.25<sup>18</sup> -

- כִּי צָרְרִים הָיוּ לָכֶם בְּנִכְלִיהֶם אֲשֶׁר נִכְלוּ לָכֶם -

"For they distress you with their guiles, wherewith they have beguiled you etc", <sup>15</sup> - Onkelos translates as follows: <sup>16</sup> - אֲרִי מַעֲקִין אִינוֹן לִכְנוֹן בְּנִכְלִיהוֹן דִּי נִכְלוּ לִכְנוֹן -

8. GEN.44<sup>15</sup> - וַיֹּאמֶר לֵהֱמוֹן... נִחַשׁ יִנְחַשׁ אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר כְּמוֹנִי

"And Joseph said....you might have known that a man like myself would practise divination".

Once again, out of consideration for Joseph, Onkelos suppressed the literal meaning of - נִחַשׁ -

"divination". It is impossible for Joseph to use divination, an act forbidden by the Torah. <sup>17</sup> (LEV.19<sup>26</sup>; DEUT.18<sup>10</sup>). Consequently, Onkelos plays it down and interprets as follows:- הֲלֹא יָדַעְתִּין אֲרִי בִדְקָא מְבַדֵּק -

גְּבֵרָא דִּיכֹרֵתִי -

"Did you not know that a man like me is capable of inspection....."

GROUP B

Rashi, although he was not meticulous in his choice of words<sup>18</sup> since he is prepared to use the word - לִנְחֵשׁ - in his interpretation, nevertheless comes to the defence of Joseph. And explains this "Are you not aware that so distinguished a person as I, knows how to divine, to discover by my own intelligence and commonsense, or by logical deduction that it was you who stole the goblet". The latter part of Rashi is merely an explanation as to the meaning of divination in this context. In other words Joseph's divination consisted merely of the application of commonsense and intelligence, but an act of divination proper was not committed by Joseph.<sup>19</sup>

9. GEN.49<sup>5</sup> - שִׁמְעוֹן וְלֵוִי אֲחֵיהֶם כָּלִי חָמֶס מִכְרִיתֵיהֶם -  
 "Simon and Levi are brothers, their spades became weapons of violence".

Out of consideration for the image of Simeon and Levi, Onkelos refuses to accept that the Patriarch's sons dealt in violence, he therefore [followed by Rashi in his second interpretation] - explains that - ג' - and - כ' - ( - מִגְרִיתֵיהֶם - means - מִכְרִיתֵיהֶם - interchanging ) - their sojournings. Onkelos' translation reads as follows:- בְּאַרְצֵן יְדֻתְבוֹרִיתֵיהֶון<sup>20</sup> -  
 - יְבוֹרִתֵיהֶון גְּבוֹרִתֵיהֶון - "In their land of their sojourning,



GROUP B

they acted mightily".<sup>21</sup>

10. GEN.49<sup>7</sup> - אָרוּר אַפֶּם כִּי עָן . . .

"A curse be on their anger because it was fierce".

To save the honour of Simeon and Levi, Ps. Jonathan, the Palestinian Targum and Neofiti believe that the Patriarch cursed the city of Shechem and not his children's anger:-

לִיט הוּה כְּרָכָא דְשַׁכֶּם כִּד עָלוּן  
שְׁמַעוֹן וְלוֹי לְגוּוּה לְמַחְרַבָּה יְתֵה בְרוּגְזָהוֹן -

"Accursed was the town of Shechem when Simeon and Levi entered to destroy it in their wrath". Perhaps, Onkelos should also be understood in their wrath".

Perhaps, Onkelos should also be understood in the light of the Palestinian Targumim:-

לִיט רִגְזָהוֹן - that the city of Shechem was 22  
cursed and that is why the brothers venged their anger.

In this particular instance Rashi does not follow the Targumim and believes that the text is self-

explanatory, namely that the Patriarch did not curse his children but rather their anger:-

אֲבִילוּ בְשַׁעַר -  
תּוֹכַחַה לֹא קִילֵל אֶלֶּא אַפֶּם -

## GROUP C

Veneration and Idealization of the Prophet Moses

1. NUM.12<sup>1</sup> - וידבר מרים ואהרן... אלה האשה הכעירה -

"And Miriam and Aaron spoke against Moses because of the Cushite woman etc".

It appears that in those days marrying an "Ethiopian" i.e. negroid woman was regarded, somehow, as not done.

Consequently out of respect to Moses, Onkelos

translates - איתת עפיררתא - by - האשה הכעירה -

"a beautiful woman". Rashi, too, follows his translation

and thus he says: "This tells us that all agree as to her beauty just as all agree as to the blackness of an

Ethiopian".<sup>1</sup> Rashi goes on to explain that the numerical

value of the word - כעירה - is the same (736) as that

of - יפת מראה - a woman of beautiful appearance.<sup>2</sup>

And so Onkelos and Rashi out of respect for Moses take

- כעירה - to mean beautiful.<sup>3</sup>

2. NUM.11<sup>17</sup> - Rashi says understand - ואצלתי - as the

Targum does:- וארבי - "And I shall induct into a

position of authority." The verb אצל - seems in the

context to mean "to withdraw",<sup>4</sup> and perhaps it is more

appropriate to take it in the sense of - פרע - "to

set apart". In fact in GEN.31<sup>9</sup> Onkelos translates -

ואפרע (נצל) - by - ואפרע. (cf. Rashi GEN.27<sup>36</sup> -

הלא אצלתי לי - לשון הפרעה כמו ואצל).

Perhaps, however, out of respect for Moses, Onkelos

and Rashi refused to take it in the sense "to withdraw"

GROUP C

for otherwise it would appear that Moses' spirit would be diminished once God would place it upon the Elders of Israel, hence - וארבי. In other words as Rashi explains in the name of the Siphre:-

למה משה דומה באותה שעה? לנר שמונח על גבי  
מנורה והכל מדליקין הימנו ואין אורו חסר כלום -

"What was Moses like to at that moment? He was like to a light that is placed in a candlestick at which everybody lights his candle (or lamp) and yet its illuminating power is not at all diminished."<sup>5</sup>

3. Again NUM.11<sup>25</sup> - ויהי כנוח עליהם הרוח ויתנבאו ולא יספו -

"....as the spirit alighted on them, they fell into a prophetic ecstasy, for the first and only time".

Rashi quotes two explanations to the words - ולא יספו -

a). לא נתנבאו אלא אותו היום בלבד -

"They prophesied only on that day alone".<sup>6</sup>

b). ואונקלוס תרגם ולא פסקן שלא פסקה נבואה מהם.

Onkelos, however, rendered - ולא פסקן - and they did not cease, meaning that the gift of prophecy never again departed from them.<sup>7</sup>

Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti interpret likewise:-

....מתנבאין ולא פסקין -

Perhaps Onkelos refused to take it in the former sense since in this particular instance the gift of prophecy was bestowed by Moses upon Eldad and Medad and

GROUP C

therefore in his honour the spirit never departed from them.

4. NUM.11<sup>12</sup> - האנכי הרייתי את כל העם -  
"Am I their mother?"

Onkelos declined to interpret - הרייתי - in its literal sense and making Moses as a mother he therefore translates - האב אנא לכל עמא - "Am I father<sup>8</sup> to all this people".<sup>9</sup> This change can be either out of respect to Moses or might be linguistic commonsense. Rashi does not comment on the text. Most probably he took it as a common expression used in biblical times.

5. EX.4<sup>6</sup> - ואמר...הבה נא ידך...והנה ידו מצרעת כשלג -  
"Then the Lord said....and when he drew it out the skin was diseased, white as snow".

Onkelos translates the words - והנה ידו מצרעת כשלג - by - והא ידה חורא כשלגא - "And behold his hand is white as snow".<sup>10</sup> The Targum for the word - מצרע - leper - is - סגיר - and the word - צרע - is usually translated by - סגיר - (See LEV.13<sup>1-28</sup>). However, in the verse in question, Onkelos has omitted the word - מצרע. Perhaps here too, out of respect for Moses, Onkelos has deleted this word

GROUP C

from his Targum, so as not to make Moses even temporarily a leper. Since the biblical treatment of - צרע - "leprosy" - apparently implies some moral as well as physical taint, necessitating the bringing of a sin-offering on recovery. Rashi, somehow does not seem to be concerned with Onkelos' remarks.<sup>11</sup>

GROUP D

Veneration of Aaron, The Priests and the People  
of Israel.

---

1. EX.32<sup>5</sup> - וַיֵּרָא אֶהָרֶן וּבֵן מִזִּבְחֵהּ לִפְנֵי . . .  
 "And when Aaron saw it, he built an altar before it".<sup>1</sup>  
 Some Rabbis in the Midrash are of the opinion that  
 Aaron built the Altar to the golden calf,<sup>2</sup> and not  
 to God.

Onkelos who translates - מִזְבֵּחַ א - by - מִזְבֵּחַ - seems  
 to reject the above mentioned opinion for otherwise he  
 would have translated<sup>3</sup> - אֱלֹהִים - by - מִזְבֵּחַ -  
 which is the usual translation given by Onkelos when  
 sacrifices are offered to idols.<sup>4</sup>

Rashi, too, who has much in common with Onkelos, in  
 his own way endeavours to defend Aaron and thus  
 minimises his sin. Rashi<sup>5</sup> points out that Aaron  
 undertook to build the Altar single-handed because he  
 was confident that during the long time that it would  
 take him to build it, Moses would return and that they  
 would revert to the worship of the omnipresent.

2. EX.24<sup>11</sup> - וַיַּחֲזֹק אֱלֹהִים - וַיִּשְׁטֹחַ אֱלֹהִים  
 "But the Lord did not stretch out his hands towards  
 the leaders of Israel. They saw God; and they ate and  
 they drank".

Rashi interprets<sup>6</sup> - וַיִּחֲזֹק אֱלֹהִים - "they  
 gazed at him uninhibitedly ( בְּלִבְבוֹתָם ) as though  
 their association with Him were a matter of eating

GROUP D

and drinking. Thus the Midrash Tanhuma explains it. Onkelos, however, does not translate the passage this way". In other words Onkelos does not take it in a depreciative sense as implying that Nadab and Abihu and the Elders acted improperly. His translation is as follows:<sup>7</sup> - "they beheld God's glory and rejoiced in their offerings, which were accepted as though they were eating and drinking. Although perhaps, Rashi does not seem to favour Onkelos' interpretation, yet it is clear that Onkelos interpreted so only out of respect to Nadab, Abihu and the Elders and thus covered up for their sins which Rashi had pointed out.

3. In all instances where the Torah refers to "priests", whether priests ministering to God or other duties the Torah describes them as "Cohanim". Onkelos, however, out of respect for the priests of God, differentiates between those who minister to God for whom he uses<sup>8</sup> the term - כהני "Cohanim" and those of other Deities, for whom he uses the term<sup>9</sup> - כוהני אלהים - Furthermore, in GEN.41<sup>45</sup> - ( כהן און ) EX.2<sup>16</sup> - ( כהן מדין ) and EX.3<sup>1</sup> - ( כהן מדין ). Onkelos points out that in these instances the term "Cohen" does not denote "minister", but rather - רב - one of high rank.

GROUP D

In all these cases, Rashi follows the distinction made by Onkelos, and thus he says in GEN.47<sup>22</sup> - without quoting Onkelos: "The term "Cohen"<sup>10</sup> always means one who ministers to a Deity except in those cases where it denotes one of high rank, e.g. EX.2<sup>16</sup> - Jethro the chief of Midian", and GEN.41<sup>45</sup> - the Chief of On".<sup>11</sup>

4. Furthermore, Onkelos displays great respect to the Israelites e.g. EX.1<sup>7</sup> - וּבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל פָּרוּ וַיִּשְׂרְצוּ - "Now the Israelites were fruitful and prolific etc." The word - וַיִּשְׂרְצוּ - is literally "they swarmed" - a word used of the profusion of reptiles. Consequently out of respect to the children of Israel, Onkelos substitutes - וַיִּשְׂרְצוּ - by - וַיִּתְרַבּוּ - "they propagated".
  
5. Again DEUT.32<sup>6</sup> - עַם נִבְלָל - "debased people". Onkelos<sup>12</sup> seems to paraphrase the verse without translating the word - נִבְלָל -, and thus he says:-  
- לֹא עָמָא דְקַבִּילוּ אִוְרִיזְדָּא וְלֹא חֲכִימוּ -  
 "these are the people who received the Torah but are unwise". Perhaps this omission is out of



GROUP D

consideration for the honour of Israel.

6. Again GEN.27<sup>46</sup> - ויקצו מפני - EX.1<sup>12</sup> - קצתי בח"י ;  
 ונפגענו קצרה ; NUM.22<sup>3</sup> - בני ישראל ; NUM.21<sup>5</sup> -  
 ויקץ מאב . In all these places , out of consideration  
 for the Israelites Onkelos substituted the verb - קיץ -  
 [which means - תעב - "despised" - ] by the Aramaic  
 verb - עיק (or עיק) to harass , to press, trouble.<sup>13</sup>

Rashi and Ps. Jonathan's Targum

Two of the earliest Palestinian Targumim on the Torah are the Jerusalem Targum I, also known as Ps. Jonathan, and the Jerusalem Targum II, also known as the Fragment Targum. The Jerusalem I had the letters - "ת" - as an abbreviation for - תרגום ירושלמי - and in the 14th century A.D. this was erroneously taken for "Targum Jonathan", hence the appellation - Pseudo-Jonathan<sup>1</sup>. This Targum is practically complete and it consists of Peshat, Halacha and Haggadah. On the whole the Haggadah and Halacha of this Targum is in harmony with that of the Mishna, Talmudim and other Rabbinic works such as the Mechilta, Siphre, and Siphra. The legends which are attached to biblical events, as well as reward and punishment and other ethical elements mentioned in this Targum are in accordance with Rabbinic views. Messianic hopes as well as a brighter future for the people of Israel are vividly portrayed in this Targum. This Targum has also a highly developed angelology and in a dramatic way it describes how millions of Angels descended with God to Egypt for the killing of the firstborn.<sup>2</sup> In short most likely the author's attempt was not merely to provide a translation<sup>3</sup> to the biblical text but also an elaborate exposition with full midrashic interpretations which were current in his lifetime.

Having made this short introduction let us now analyse whether Rashi, who is our main subject, has used Ps. Jonathan's Targum or not? According to A. Berliner<sup>4</sup> Rashi has not seen Ps. Jonathan's Targum and this is why he has never quoted him. In the Babylonian Talmud, Git.p.8<sup>a</sup> Rashi, however, mentions the Jerusalem Targum - **הר ההר (במדר לך) ובתרגום ירושלמי מתרגם** - **הר ההר תורי אמנון** -

Berliner, however, believes that originally in Rashi's text the abbreviation - **ר"י** - which stands for "Talmud Jerusalem" was mentioned, and at a later time the printers erroneously took it for "Targum Jerusalem". This is not convincing as other commentators quoted the same translation in the name<sup>5</sup> of Jerusalem Targum. Furthermore the Jerusalem Talmud does not speak about the "Mount Hor" in question.

There is, however, every reason to believe that Rashi's text is correct and that he had in mind Ps. Jonathan for the latter translates - **הר ההר** - (NUM.34<sup>7</sup>)

by<sup>6</sup> - **לגאורוס, אומני** - The Palestinian Targum as well as Neofiti<sup>7</sup> take it as - **לגאורוס מנוס** -

which is the equivalent of - **תורי אמנון** - quoted by Rashi. Most probably, Rashi was not careful in quoting the exact words of the Jerusalem Targum and quoted - **תורי אמנון** - as the talmudical text

has it.

In Babylonian Talmud, Baba Metsia, p.21, Rashi explains the mishnaic word - כר'כור - "bundles" - as follows:-

- כר'כות - עומר'ים קטנים כמו מאלמים אלומים -

ומתרגמין בירושלמי מכרכן כירוכין. -

"The word - כר'כות - means small bundles as the Jerusalem Targum translates on GEN.ch.37<sup>6</sup> - והנה -

- אנהנו מאלמים אלמים - Behold we were binding sheaves etc". Here, too, Berliner believes that this comment is not from Rashi but an interpolation from a later writer since Ps. Jonathan's<sup>8</sup> Targum translates

- מפרכין פירוכין - by - מאלמים אלומים - (פרך - to tie dry ears - hence to bind sheaves<sup>9</sup>).

This is not conclusive as most probably Rashi had a different reading in Ps. Jonathan. Indeed I am inclined to believe that Rashi had before him the Neofiti version<sup>10</sup> (or part of it) which is also a Palestinian Targum and there the reading is - מכרכין -

- as Rashi has it.

In addition in his commentary on GEN.Rabbah<sup>11</sup>, Rashi quotes the Jerusalem Targum. It reads as follows:- GEN.25<sup>3</sup> - ובני דדן היו אשורים ולטושים ולאומים -

And the sons of Dedan were Ashurim and Letushim and Leumim. - בתרגום ירושלמי מפרש בני דדן היו אשורים ולטושים. אשורים - מאשורים היו בדרכים. לטושים - לוטעי נחשת.

The Jerusalem Targum interprets - אַשְׁוּרִי - by successful business men,<sup>12</sup> and - לְמַשְׁוִּי - by those who sharpen (or polish) the metal. This interpretation is found once again in Neofiti<sup>13</sup> who translate the text by - תַּגְרִין, וְאַמְּוֹרִין, וְרַאשֵׁי -  
- אַמְּוִין - business men, spear bearer<sup>14</sup> (or guardsmen) and heads<sup>15</sup> of tribes.<sup>16</sup>

We may, therefore, say that Rashi did not possess Ps. Jonathan while he wrote his commentary on the Torah, but that it came into his hands at a later time when he revised his commentary and entered into it many interpretations of Ps. Jonathan without mentioning his name or just by saying "Understand the verse as the Targum does": The fact that he does not mention him by name is not at all surprising when we bear in mind that Rashi did not quote his sources.

Furthermore, Rashi on the Torah, rarely quotes even Jonathan on the prophets by name,<sup>17</sup> although the Talmud knows him as the author of the Targum on the prophets.<sup>18</sup> He simply quotes his translation and says - וְרַגְמֵן - or - חֲרֵטְרֵמִין - .

Whether Rashi possessed the whole commentary of Ps. Jonathan as we have it in its present form is certainly open to question. But there is reason to assume that he had parts of it, and especially when

we see that some of Rashi's interpretations correspond to those of Ps. Jonathan and not the Midrashim available to us.

Here are a few examples to illustrate that Rashi had before him some texts of Ps. Jonathan and used the latter interpretations without saying - כתרגומו .

1. GEN.3<sup>22</sup> - הן האדם היה כאחד ממנו  
 "The man has become like one of us etc...."  
 Rashi interprets - כאחד ממנו - הרי הוא יחיד בתחתונים -  
 כמו שאני יחיד בעליונים וכך...  
 This phraseology of Rashi is identical with that  
 of Ps. Jonathan: - הא אדם הזה יחיד בארץ  
 היכמא דאנא יחיד בשמי מרוקא -  
 "Behold man is unique among the terrestrial<sup>19</sup> ones,  
 even as I am unique among the celestial ones".
  
2. GEN.4<sup>15</sup> - וישם ה' לקין אות לבלתי היותו מותו כל מוצאו -  
 "So the Lord put a mark on Cain, in order that  
 anyone meeting him should not kill him".  
 Rashi explains - אות - חקק לו אות משמו במצחו -  
 He (God) inscribed on his forehead<sup>20</sup> a letter of the  
 Divine Name.<sup>21</sup> It is the same in Ps. Jonathan: -  
 "ורשם ה' על אפי דקין אתא מן שמה רבא  
 וקרא וכך..."

3. GEN.16<sup>12</sup> - וְהָיָה כַּחַם אִדִּים וְכָל בֹּן  
 "He shall be a man like the wild ass....and every man's  
 hand against him".

Rashi explains - וְכָל בֹּן - הַכֹּל שׁוֹנֵאִין אוֹתוֹ וּמַתְּגֵרִין בּוֹ  
 Everyone will hate him and attack him.

Ps. Jonathan<sup>22</sup> - וְיָדִי בְּעַלִּי דַבְּבוּ יְהוֹשֻׁעַן לֹאבָאֲשָׁא בֵּיה -

4. GEN.19<sup>4</sup> - טָרִם יִשְׁכְּבוּ וְאֲנָשֵׁי הָעִיר -  
 "Before they lay down to sleep, the men [ of the city]  
 of Sodom"

Rashi says:- וּפְשׁוּטָו שֶׁל מְקֵרָא - וְאֲנָשֵׁי הָעִיר -  
 - וְאֲנָשֵׁי רָשָׁע .

The real sense of the text is:- the men of the city,  
 wicked men...

Ps. Jonathan<sup>23</sup> - וְאִינְטֵין רִשִּׁי'ין דְּבִקְרָרָה -

5. GEN.24<sup>22</sup> - וַיִּקַּח הָאִישׁ נָזֶם זָהָב בְּקָץ מִשְׁקָלָו -  
 "...the man took a gold nose-ring weighing half a  
 shekel..."

Rashi explains:- בְּקָץ - רָמַז לְעֻקְלֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּקָץ  
 לְגַלְגַּלֶּת, וְשֵׁן צִמְדִּים, רָמַז לְשֵׁן לִחוֹת  
 מְצוּמְדוּת.

Beka - a symbol of the shekels of the Israelites of

which it is said (EX.38<sup>26</sup>) "Beka (half a shekel) a head".

Two bracelets - a symbol of the two tablets of stone, joined one to another.<sup>24</sup>

Whilst the Derash regarding the "two bracelets" is mentioned in GEN. Rabbah, 60.6, the symbol regarding the "Beka" is found in none of the older sources except in Ps. Jonathan.<sup>25</sup>

— ונסיב גברא קדשא דדהבה  
 דרכמונא מתקליה קביל דרכמונא לגלגליתא,  
 דאשמוסין בנהא למיתב לציבדת משכנא וכו'...

6. GEN.30<sup>11</sup> - ותאמר לאה בגד —

"Leah said, good fortune has come".

Rashi explains:- בא-גד - בא מול טוב ...

Ps. Jonathan<sup>26</sup> - ואמרת לאה אתא מולא שבא -

7. GEN.31<sup>27</sup> - למה נחבאת לברוח ותגנב ארצי -

"Why did you slip away secretly (lit. steal away from me) without telling me".

Rashi - ותגנב ארצי - וגנבת את דערי -

- "you did steal away my mind".

Ps. Jonathan is exactly the same - למה איתמר -

לימול וגנבת דערי -

Neofiti gives also the same interpretation in verse 26:-

- ואמר לבן לינקב מה עבדת וגנבת ית דערי -



8. GEN.31<sup>39</sup> - גַּנְבִּיתִי יוֹם וּגְנִבְתִּי לַיְלָה -

"You claimed compensation from me for anything stolen by day or by night".

Rashi explains:- גְּנִיבְתִּי - גְּנִיבְתִּי יוֹם אוֹ גְּנִיבְתִּי לַיְלָה -  
הַכֹּל שֶׁלֹּמְתִי -

whether stolen by day or stolen by night - everything I paid back.

Ps. Jonathan<sup>27</sup> - מִה דַּמְתִּיגִיב בִּימָמָה מִבֵּן נֶשֶׁא עָלַי -  
הוּה לֹאשְׁלֵמָה וְמִה דְהוּה מִתְגִּיב בְּלֵילָה מִן חַיִּית  
בֵּרָא עָלַי הוּה לִמְשֻׁלָּמָה -

9. GEN.31<sup>54</sup> - וַיִּקְרָא לְאֶחָיו לֵאמֹל לֶחֶם -

....And summoned his kinsmen to the feast (lit. to eat bread).

Rashi - לְאֶחָיו - לְאוֹהֲבָיו שָׁעַם לֵבָן -

His brethren - those of his friends who were with Laban.

Ps. Jonathan<sup>28</sup> - וּזְמַן לִקְרִיבוֹ דְאִתְּנוּ עִם לֵבָן -

10. GEN.37<sup>30</sup> - וְאֵת אֲנָה אֵת בָּא -

"The boy is not there. Where can I go?"

Rashi explains:- אֲנָה אֵת בָּא - אֲנָה אֲבִירָה -  
מִצָּעְרוֹ שֶׁל אֲבִי -

Whither can I flee from my father's grief?"

Ps. Jonathan<sup>29</sup> - וְאֵת לֵבָן אֲנָה אֵת וְהִכְלִין נַחֲמִי סֹבֵר אֶפֶס דְּאֵבָא ...

11. GEN.49<sup>6</sup> - וברצונם עקרו שור -

"For in their anger they killed men, wantonly they hamstrung oxen".

Rashi explains:- עקרו שור - רצו לעקור את יוסף שנקרא שור

They desired to exterminate Joseph who is called "ox" etc....

The Palestinian Targum reads:- ובקויתיהו וב'נו יוסף

אמיהו דמתיל לרבוך א -  
And in their desire they sold their brother Joseph who is compared to an ox.<sup>30</sup>

12. EX.2<sup>12</sup> - וירא כי אין איש ו'ך את המצרי -

"...and seeing there was no one about he struck the Egyptian down..."

Rashi - וירא כי אין איש - עתיד לצאת ממנו ע'תג"ר -

When he saw that there was no man destined to issue from him, who would become a convert to Judaism.....

Ps. Jonathan<sup>31</sup> - ואסתכל משה במכמת דעתיה ואיתבון -

בכל דר ודר והא לא קאים מן ההוא מצראי גבר  
ג'ור וכו'...

13. EX.29<sup>20</sup> - ונתתה על תנוך א'זן אהרן -

".....and put it on the lobes of the right ears of Aaron and his sons..."

- תנוך - הוא הסמוס האמצעי שביתוך האוזן -  
 This is the inner cartilage<sup>32</sup> which is within the ear...  
 While Onkelos and Neofiti take it to mean - רוע אודנא -  
 the high part of the ear - Ps. Jonathan is exactly  
 like Rashi - ויתכן על הסמוס אודנא דאהרן

14. NUM.14<sup>10</sup> - וכבוד ה' נראה באהל מועד -  
 "....the glory of the Lord appeared to them all  
 in the tent of the Presence".  
 Rashi - וכבוד ה' - הענן ירד שם  
 The Glory of the Lord - i.e. the cloud descended  
 there. Ps. Jonathan<sup>33</sup> - ואיקר שכינתא דה' אתגלי -  
 בענני יקרא במשכן ומנא -

15. NUM.21<sup>18</sup> - באר חפרוה שרים -  
 "The spring unearthed by the princes...."  
 Rashi - שרים - מעשה ואהרן  
 This is the well which the princes, Moses and Aaron  
 dug.  
 Ps. Jonathan<sup>34</sup> - חפרוה יתה רישי צמח מעשה ואהרן -  
 ספריהון לישראל -

16. NUM.27<sup>21</sup> - ולבנ אלעזר הכהן יעמר ושאל לו -

"He must appear before Elazar the priest, who will obtain a decision for him by consulting...."

Rashi - ושאל לו - כשיצטרך לצאת למלחמה -

And ask of him - whenever he finds it necessary to go forth to war.

Ps. Jonathan<sup>35</sup> -

על מימרא דאלעזר כהנא יהון  
נפקין לסדרי קרבא

17. DEUT.4<sup>23</sup> - ועשיתם לכם פסל תמונת כל אשר צוך ה' -

....and do not make yourselves a carved figure of everything which the Lord your God has [commanded you] .

Rashi - אשר צוך - אשר צוך שלא לעשות -

i.e. which He commanded thee not to make.

Ps. Jonathan<sup>36</sup> - דפקדינכון ה' אלהיכון דלא למעבד -

18. DEUT.33<sup>20</sup> - ושרף זרוץ אף קדקד -

"....tearing an arm or a scalp".

Rashi - זרץ אף קדקד - הרוגיהן היו נכרין, חות כ"ס -

הראש עם הזרץ במכה אחת -

Those whom they slew could easily be recognised, because they used to cut off the head together with the arm at one blow.

Ps. Jonathan<sup>37</sup> - וקבלו חכימן מן כל קטוליא דמגור -

אורעא עם קודקדא -

Furthermore in some instances Rashi says - כתר-גומל - "Understand this as the Targum does" - and his interpretation corresponds to that of Ps. Jonathan and not to Onkelos. But sometimes by the expression - כתר-גומל - Rashi means both Ps. Jonathan and Onkelos, for he has fused the two interpretations in order to elucidate the verse.

Here are a few examples to illustrate these points:

19. EX.16<sup>33</sup> - וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אֶל אַהֲרֹן קח צִנְעָנָה אֶחָדָה -

"So Moses said to Aaron, take a jar and fill it...."

Rashi - צִנְעָנָה - צִלּוּחִית שֶׁל חֶרֶס כְּתֵר-גּוֹמֵל

It is an earthen flask, as it is translated in the Targum.

Onkelos translates without elaboration<sup>38</sup> as to the material

וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה לְאַהֲרֹן טַב צִלּוּחִית חֶרֶס.

By the expression - כְּתֵר-גּוֹמֵל - Rashi must have meant Ps. Jonathan where this interpretation occurs:-

וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה לְאַהֲרֹן טַב צִלּוּחִית דְּפֶחֶר חֶרֶס. - a flask of earthenware.<sup>39</sup>

20. NUM.14<sup>4</sup> - וַתֵּנָה רָאשׁ וְנִשְׁוֹבָה מִצְרִימָה -

"And they began to talk of choosing someone to lead them back".

Rashi explains - נִתְּנָה רֹאשׁ - כְּתִרְגוּמוֹ, נָמַנְ רִישָׁא , -

נְשִׁים עֲלֵינוּ מֶלֶךְ

Understand this as the Targum does: let us appoint a chief - let us set a king over us.

Whilst the first part of Rashi - נָמַנְ רִישָׁא -

is from Onkelos, the second part is from Ps. Jonathan<sup>40</sup> -

- נָמַנְ עָלֵינוּ מֶלֶךְ לְרִישׁ וְנִתּוּב לְמַצְרִים -

and Rashi has fused the two interpretations.

21. DEUT.24<sup>5</sup> - וְשִׂמַּח אֶת אִשְׁתּוֹ אֲשֶׁר לָקַח

"And shall<sup>41</sup> cheer up his wife whom he hath taken".

Rashi - וְשִׂמַּח - יְשַׂמַּח אֶת אִשְׁתּוֹ, וְתִרְגְּמוֹ יִתְּנֵי יָד

אֲתִידָהּ. וְהַתִּירָגָם יִתְּנֵי עִם אֲתִידָהּ שׁוֹעָה הוּא עֲאִין  
זֶה תִּרְגְּמוֹ עַל יְשַׂמַּח אֶלָּא יְשַׂמַּח

The verb - יְשַׂמַּח - in the piel is causative and

means - he shall gladden his wife, its correct

Targum rendering is - יִתְּנֵי יָד אֲתִידָהּ (aph'el)

which expresses this: he, however, who translates

in the Targum - יִתְּנֵי עִם אֲתִידָהּ (pe'al) - "he shall rejoice with his wife" - is in error, for this

is not the Targum equivalent of - יְשַׂמַּח (piel)

but of - יְשַׂמַּח (pe'al).

In all the books of the Targum Onkelos available to us,

the reading is - יִתְּנֵי יָד אֲתִידָהּ - corresponding

to the piel. Rashi, therefore, most probably refutes

Ps. Jonathan<sup>42</sup> where the reading<sup>43</sup> is - וְיִחַדְי  
עַם אֱתֵרְיָה לְנָסִיב

22. DEUT.28<sup>64</sup> - וְעַבַּדְתָּ שָׁם אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים

"And there you will worship other gods etc..."

Rashi - אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים - כִּתְּרָגוֹמוֹ לֹא עַבְדֵת אֱלֹהוֹת -

מִמַּעַל מַעֲלִים מִסֵּו וּגְוִלְגִּלּוֹת לְכֹוֹמְרֵי עַבְדֵת זָרָה -

Understand this as the Targum does - (וְתַבְלֵחַ תִּמְן לְעַמְמֵי כְלִי טַעֲוִיתָא -  
- you will serve the people<sup>44</sup> that worship idols ]  
not actually that they serve idols, but they will  
have to pay tribute and poll-taxes to the priests of  
the idols.

A. Bromberg<sup>45</sup> believes that Rashi is referring to  
Ps. Jonathan who explains exactly like Rashi:-

וְתִהְיוּ מִסַּק אֲרֻנָּה לְכִלֵּי טַעֲוִיתָא -

This is not convincing as Onkelos himself can be  
interpreted in this way.<sup>46</sup> At any rate Rashi's idea  
that the Israelites "will pay tribute and poll-taxes  
to the priests of the idols" is not specifically  
mentioned<sup>47</sup> in Ps. Jonathan.<sup>48</sup>

Rashi and Jonathan's Targum on the Prophets.

As said throughout our thesis Rashi made use of Onkelos' Targum as well as of the Jerusalem Targumim. Another Targum which Rashi used on the Torah is Jonathan on the prophets. However, whilst on the Torah<sup>1</sup> Rashi seeks his support occasionally, on the prophets he uses him extensively. According to the Talmud<sup>2</sup> Jonathan ben Uzziel, a disciple of Hillel the Elder, wrote the Targum on the prophets. Quite often Rashi relies on Jonathan's Targum and follows his modes of interpretations. Perhaps the following two factors caused Rashi to favour Jonathan's Targum. Firstly, because his translation fits with the plain meaning of the text<sup>3</sup> and secondly unlike Onkelos' Targum, there are very "few Halachot" to be derived from the books of the prophets, nor in Jonathan's translation, which otherwise would necessitate a thorough investigation as to whether his interpretations correspond with the current Halacha.

Rashi was greatly influenced by Jonathan to the extent that after interpreting the text according to him he believed that "no other interpretation could be made on the text and no addition could be added on Jonathan's Targum".<sup>4</sup> The midrashic interpretations of Jonathan are fully incorporated in Rashi's commentary.<sup>5</sup> And sometimes he even



rejects the midrashic interpretations of the Rabbis and accepts those of Jonathan<sup>6</sup> because they accord better with the biblical text. He even supports Onkelos' interpretations on the Torah from Jonathan's Targum on the prophets.<sup>7</sup> If a vision of a prophet is difficult and unintelligible to comprehend, Rashi, once again, turns to Jonathan for clarification.<sup>8</sup>

Finally it appears that while Rashi has seen the "Targum Sheni"<sup>9</sup> on the book of Esther, he was, however, unaware of the existence of any Targum on the rest<sup>10</sup> of Hagiographia.<sup>11</sup>

NOTES - GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1. For more details about Rashi's life and time, see A. Owen, Rashi, his Life and Times 1952: Rashi, his Teachings and Personality, ed. by S. Federbush 1958 pp.131-155; S.A. Poznanski - מבוא אל חכמי צרפת - מפרשי המקרא; Encyclopedia Judaica, Keter, Jerusalem, 1974, v.13, p.1558 ff. E.M. Lifshits, Rashi, Mossad Harav Kook, Jerusalem, 1966.
2. Possibly his birth was about 1030. See H. Hailperin, Rashi and the Christian Scholars, Pittsburgh Press, 1963, pp.25 and 270 - following V. Aptowitzer, Mabo Lesefer Rabiah, Jerusalem, 1938, p. 395.
3. See *ibid* Encyclopedia Judaica.
4. See A. Berliner, Toledoth Piroushe Rashi, p.152 -  
 "בימי רש"י עלתה טפת ד"ו זהוב זהב."
5. See Rashi - by M. Liber, p.95.
6. cf. Rashi GEN.49<sup>21</sup> - אילה שלוחה - ורבותינו דרשוהו על גזע קבורת יעקב כעצרת עשו על המקרה במסכת סוטה.  
 Despite his occasional inclusion of succinct summaries of aggadic material, it is difficult to assume that Rashi intended his commentary for the masses alone, since he often incorporates therein complicated halachic material which would be beyond the grasp of many a general reader.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

7. The nickname "Tam" was given him because his name was Jacob and it is written - GEN.25<sup>29</sup> - וַיִּקְרָב אִישׁ יָדָם. The term signifies perfection both in knowledge and in character.
8. H. Waxman, Rashi his Teachings and Personality - ed. by S. Federbush, Rashi as commentator of the Bible, p.20. The attribution of this statement to Rabbenu Tam is doubtful since Rashbam, records Rashi's own self-criticism with regard to his commentary on the Torah. See Rashbam, beginning of Parashat - בָּרָא
9. See Rashi by M. Liber, p.104. The Persian word Parshandata, name of <sup>one of</sup> the sons of Haman, was divided into "Parshan" and "data" - expounder of the law. This epithet was attributed to him by Ibn Ezra in his poem. See, *ibid*, ch.11, p.207 and note 59 in p.249.
10. See Halachic Section.
11. See Midrashic Section.
12. See Section, Rashi as Philologist.
13. See Introduction, Rashi as Philologist ; also ch.6, Onkelos and the Hebrew Grammar.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

14. GEN.2<sup>19</sup>... - וכל אשר יקרא לו האדם - סרסוהו ופרשוהו, כל נפש חיה אשר יקרא...  
cf. GEN.14<sup>15</sup>; GEN.41<sup>57</sup>; NUM.27<sup>2</sup>. See Introduction,  
Rashi as Philologist.
  
15. cf. GEN.1<sup>5</sup>; GEN.6<sup>7</sup> with GEN. Rabbah. See Midrashic  
Section, Rashi's Correlation to Peshat and Derash,  
Group E.(F).
  
16. cf. GEN.3<sup>8</sup> - י"ש מורע' אגדה רבי'ם וכבר סידרו' רבותינו על -  
מטנ' בב"ר ובשאר מדרשות, ואט' לא באנו אלא לפשוט' של מקרא  
ולאגדה המ"ש בדבר' המקרא דבר רב'ר על אופניו.  
See Midrashic Section, Rashi and Peshat, Group E.(C).
  
17. For the sake of clarity we shall term in this thesis  
Rashi's own halachic interpretations as "Peshat  
Halacha", in contradistinction to "Derash Halacha", i.e.  
wider halachic implications discussed in the Talmud:  
not that the two need be in conflict. See Halachic  
Section, Group G. note 3.
  
18. cf. Rashi EX.22<sup>8</sup>; EX.23<sup>2</sup>.
  
19. cf. Rashi EX.12<sup>6</sup> s.v - ושחטו; EX.12<sup>6</sup> s.v - קהל;  
EX.12<sup>7</sup>; EX.12<sup>14</sup>; EX.12<sup>15</sup>; EX.12<sup>19</sup>; EX.20<sup>3</sup>. See EX.  
ch.21<sup>1</sup> to ch.23<sup>19</sup> where in most cases Rashi follows the  
Halacha. The reader will find many more examples  
throughout his commentary. See Halachic Section.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

20. cf. Rashi LEV.13<sup>6</sup> - כהה-הא אש עמר במראיתו או פשה נמא  
 "Consequently, if it remains in its true colour or if it has spread he is unclean". See Nahmanides, who states that Rashi's conclusion is correct according to the literal sense of the text, but contrary to the Mishna in Negaim 1.3 - "והוא באמת משמעות הכתוב אבל לפי מדרש רבותינו אינון שהרישנו להסגיר את הקומל בסוף שבוע ראשון ולפי שור את הקומל בסוף שבוע שניה וכו'..."  
 See E. Mizrahi who admits that Rashi is against the Halacha. See Halachic Section, Group G.
21. cf. Rashi EX.22<sup>12</sup> - יביאהו עד - עדים שנעדרה באנס ופטור -  
 "Let him bring witnesses (plural) that the animal was torn in pieces involuntarily and he shall be freed from liability". See the various opinions in the Mechilta, M. Friedmann, Vienna 1870, p.93. See *Halachic Section Group G*.
22. cf. EX.21<sup>34</sup> s.v - בעל הבור - Rashi interprets according to Rabbi Ishmael and not according to the accepted opinion of Rabbi Akiva. See Bab. Tal. Baba Kam.50<sup>a</sup>; for further references, see Halachic Section, Group G.
23. cf. Rashi EX.12<sup>4</sup> - ואם ימנע - ואם יהיו מוצעים מקדש משה אחד שאין יכולים -  
 לאוכלו... והו משמח לפי 36 בשו"ת. 8 וצור יש 10 בו מדרש וכו'...  
 cf.also Rashi, EX.12<sup>10</sup>; EX.22; EX.29<sup>36</sup>. See Halachic Section, Group G.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

24. cf. Rashi GEN.1<sup>1</sup>; GEN.1<sup>4</sup>; GEN.50<sup>5</sup>.
25. See Midrashic Section, Rashi and Derash, Group E.(E).
26. See Midrashic Section, Peshat in the Talmud, Group E.(b).
27. See Midrashic Section, Rashi's Occasional Reversion to the Talmudic Concept. Group E.(D).
28. See Midrashic Section, Rashi's Correlation to the Peshat and Derash, Group E.(F).
29. See Introduction, Rashi as Philologist.
30. cf. Rashi, IS.9<sup>6</sup> - מעשה וקר קולס - קולמו של חזקיהו כל ימיו וכן מצינו - שאמר חנה... ולכעובת אחריה האומרים שהוא שש יש להשיבם מהו מעשה והלא לא בא ער לסוף ג' מאות שנה.  
See ibid s.v- למרבה המעשה; Rashi PS.2<sup>1</sup>; PS.21<sup>2</sup>;  
Rashbam, his grandson challenged also the Christian's interpretation, EX.20<sup>13</sup>.
31. cf. E.M. Lifshits, Rashi, p.176.
32. Rashi LEV.23<sup>11</sup>; MEN.66<sup>a</sup>; cf. Rashi, PROV.9<sup>7</sup> - ומכיל לרשע - מומן- מוש הוא למכיל עוה מחרפו ואינו עומק לו. זו היא מזהרה שאסור לרבר עש המסיתים מדרך הישרה אפילו להוכיחם ולקרבים.  
The phraseology - לקרבים - can only refer to the Karaites and not to the Christians. See Midrashic Section, Group E.(F), note D.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

33. See Rashbam EX.13<sup>9</sup> - "לאות על ירך-לפי צומק פשוטו יהיה לך - אך לזכרון תמיד כאלו כתוב על יריך כעין שימט כמותם על לבך. בין עיניך- כעין תכשיט ורביד זהב שרגילין ליתן על המצח לטו".  
 Rabbi Joseph Becher Shor complains about the laxity of the French Jewry: "גם מבט עמינו שמעתי שמפקפקין על תפילין- ומזוזות, וכסוי הדם שאין פשוטי הדברים כפי הקבלה -"  
 See E.M. Lifshits, Rashi, p.168, infra 31. The evidence of the total neglect of the Tephillin can further be seen from the statement of Rabbenu Tam who refers to those who scorned to wear them, saying, "what is the use of these straps". See L. Rabinowitz, The Social Life of the Jews of the Northern France in the XII-XIV centuries, p.176 ff.

34. Perhaps its popularity was due to the following statements:

a) it was assumed that the "Targum was given from Sinai". (See Bab. Tal. Kid. 48<sup>a</sup>).

b) see BER. 8<sup>a</sup> - "לעולם ישלים אדם פרשיותיו שנים מקרא ואחד תרגום".

c) see Siphre, DEUT. 17<sup>9</sup> - למען ילמד ליראה - מלמד שהמורה יזבא - לדי מקרא, מקרא מביא לידי תר-גום וכ'...

d) Rab. Shalom Gaon has this to say: - "שאר התרגומים אין בהם קדושה כהרגום זה, ושמןנו כפי חכמים קדמונים שנינו גדול עשה הקב"ה באונקלוס הורג על שנעשה התרגום על ידו".

See A. Berliner, Targum Onkelos, p.172. Introduction, Rashi as Philologist; Rashi and the Text of Onkelos, ch.10.


## 34. (cont'd).

infra.1. Its popularity may also have been due to the fact that on the whole Onkelos' Targum is closer to the text than the other Palestinian Targumim and this is why it was accepted by Rabbi Akiva and his school. See B.J. Roberts, The Old Testament text and Versions, Cardiff, 1951, p.204 ff; Rabbi Moses de Leon, "Megillat Esther" (commentary on Maimonides "Sepher Hamitzvot"). p.92 - who believes that Onkelos' view should override the opinions found in a "Beraitha". cf. Rabbi Malachi Ben Jacob, Yad Malachi, New York 1905, para. 659; Rabbi David Pardo, Shoshanim Le-David (commentary on the Mishna) Kerit.ch.2. Mishna 1 - who believes that there is no need to support Onkelos from the Talmud:-

" שאין בכלל צורך למצוא סמיכות לדברי אונקלוס בתלמוד כי הוא קדם להם ולו מטפס הבכורה."

35.cf. Bab. Tal.MEG.3<sup>a</sup>; Palestinian Talmud, Meg.3. Halacha 1.

36.As can be seen from "Table Two" and "Table Three".

37.See Mishna, Meg.4.4. See also Halachic Section, Summary, note 6. That the Targum was still actually read aloud in Synagogue in Rashi's time is indicated by the fact that his contemporary Meir Ben Isaac Nehorai composed an Aramaic -  - to insert



GENERAL INTRODUCTION

note 37. (cont'd).

into the beginning of the Targum on - שבועות -  
 According to the original arrangement this was read  
 after the first verse of the Parasha - בחורש השלישי...

.... Later when the reading  
 of the Targum had been given up, the significance of  
 this position was misunderstood and the reading of  
 - מקדמות - was brought forward (by Jacob Emden) so  
 that it precedes - בחורש השלישי - Most probably the  
 reading of the Aramaic Targum was beginning to be  
 abandoned during the period of the Geonim. Rab.  
 Natronai Gaon, the head of the academy of Sura  
 (853-858) complained about the fact that - קריאת

התורה - was no longer translated into Aramaic but  
 rather into Arabic. He even excommunicated those who  
 deliberately ignored the reading of the Targum (and  
 followed the custom of the Karaites, see, Weiss,  
 Dor-Dor-Vedorshav, v.4.p.117). Rabbi Judah Ben Koresh,  
 in his letter (רסאלה) complained also that the  
 community of Fez (Morocco) had ignored the reading of  
 the Targum: - "לא הניחו קדמונים ולא חדלו מללמד בו חכמים,

ולא הסתפקו בלעדיו ראשונים, ולא נעלמה תועלתו  
 מאבותיכם, ולא התרפו בלמודו אלה שקדמו לכם בבבל  
 מצרים, אפריקה ואנדלוס (ספרד).

(אגרת רבי יהודה בן קוריש-תרגם מן "הרסאלה" -  
 משה כץ, תל-אביב תש"ב עמ' א-ב).

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

38. See Bab. Tal. Meg. p.3<sup>a</sup>.
39. cf. Rashi EX.14<sup>24</sup> and Bab.Tal. BER.3<sup>b</sup>.
40. See Bab. Tal. Abod. Zar.9<sup>a</sup> with regard to GEN.31<sup>12</sup>; Bab.Tal.Sanh.97<sup>a</sup>. In some instances Rashi has in mind Onkelos' Targum even without identifying it. cf. Bab.Tal.Ber.17<sup>a</sup> with regard to EX.24<sup>11</sup>.
41. cf. Bab.Tal.Kid.69<sup>a</sup> - DEUT.23<sup>18</sup>.
42. See Midrashic Section, Groups A,B,C,D and E.
43. See Halachic Section, Groups, A,B,C,D,E and F.
44. See Section - Rashi as Philologist, chs. 1-10.
45. cf. also Rashi, GEN.37<sup>27</sup> on the verb - שמע - See Section - Rashi as Philologist, ch.4 - Translation of Biblical Idioms Into Aramaic, notes 10 and 11.
46. cf. GEN.49<sup>24</sup> - וכן לשון התרגום על העברי - GEN.18<sup>23</sup>; EX.23<sup>2</sup> - ולשון העברי לפי התרגום כן הוא נדרש -

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

47. Rashi does not apparently focus clearly on the difference in meaning between the Kal - עָלָה - and the Piel - שָׁלַח.
48. On the subject of grammar, see Section Rashi as Philologist - ch.9. Onkelos and the Hebrew Grammar.
49. cf. also Rashi, GEN.29<sup>6</sup>; GEN.29<sup>8</sup>; EX.1<sup>17</sup>; EX.18<sup>22</sup>; EX.18<sup>26</sup>. The question of Onkelos rendering of the tenses in Hebrew according to their syntactical setting (vav conservative, i.e. consecutive, etc.) is a complex one which lies outside the scope of this thesis.
50. cf. GEN.11<sup>6</sup>; GEN.22<sup>3</sup> s.v - וַיִּבְקַע; GEN.43<sup>18</sup> s.v - וַלְהִתְגַּלֵּל - GEN.49<sup>11</sup> s.v - שָׂרָה; GEN.49<sup>22</sup> s.v - חֶבְלֵי קָלוֹ; GEN.49<sup>25</sup>; GEN.49<sup>26</sup>; EX.1<sup>11</sup>; EX.2<sup>21</sup>; EX.3<sup>19</sup> - לֹא יֵדַע - EX.3<sup>22</sup>; EX.7<sup>1</sup>; EX.7<sup>11</sup>; EX.9<sup>19</sup>; EX.16<sup>14</sup>; LEV.19<sup>16</sup>; LEV.21<sup>20</sup> s.v - מִרוּחַ אֶשֶׁךְ - LEV.22<sup>24</sup> s.v - וּבִתּוֹרַת - LEV.25<sup>4</sup>; LEV.25<sup>31</sup>; NUM.1<sup>50</sup>; DEUT.1<sup>29</sup>; DEUT.14<sup>5</sup> s.v - וְאִקּוּ - DEUT.28<sup>65</sup>; DEUT.32<sup>10</sup>.
51. cf. GEN.40<sup>11</sup> - וַאֲשַׁחֲשֶׁת-בְּתַרְגּוּמוֹ וְעֶזְרִית-וְהָרַבָּה יֵשׁ בְּלִשׁוֹן מִשְׁנָה - EX.16<sup>31</sup> s.v - כַּצְפִּיקָתָהּ; NUM.6<sup>3</sup> s.v - וְכָל מִעֲרֵרָהּ - Sometimes without identifying Onkelos by name Rashi supports his translation from the Mishna, e.g. GEN.45<sup>26</sup> s.v - גִּבְיָהּ -

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

52. cf. Rashi GEN.30<sup>38</sup> - ויצג-כתרגומו ודעין לשון תחיבה ונעיצה בלשון ארמי. והרבה יש בתלמוד  
cf. Rashi GEN.3<sup>24</sup> s.v - להג; GEN.31<sup>34</sup> s.v - בכר;  
GEN.43<sup>16</sup> s.v - בצהריש; GEN.43<sup>20</sup> s.v - בי אדוט;  
GEN.44<sup>7</sup> s.v - מלילה; GEN.48<sup>7</sup> s.v - כרוב; GEN.49<sup>11</sup> s.v -  
נעוורוי - (עיניו); GEN.49<sup>12</sup> s.v - צבזונין - (סוטה);  
EX.2<sup>10</sup> s.v - משיתהו; EX.34<sup>33</sup> s.v - מסוה; LEV.19<sup>16</sup> s.v. (רכיל);  
וכתורה - LEV.22<sup>24</sup> s.v - לא תיכול.
53. cf. Rashi EX.14<sup>27</sup>; - וינער - ושנק הוא לשון טירוף בלשון ארמי.  
והרבה יש במדרש אגדה.  
cf. NUM.5<sup>2</sup> s.v - טמא.
54. cf. Rashi GEN.31<sup>39</sup> s.v - אמתנה; GEN.43<sup>18</sup> s.v - ולהתנפל;  
EX.12<sup>7</sup>; EX.13<sup>18</sup>; EX.14<sup>24</sup>; EX.15<sup>3</sup>; EX.15<sup>4</sup>; EX.21<sup>25</sup>;  
EX.27<sup>9</sup>; EX.28<sup>4</sup>; LEV.26<sup>36</sup>; NUM.31<sup>49</sup>; DEUT.5<sup>18</sup>; DEUT.11<sup>14</sup>.
55. cf. Rashi GEN.45<sup>26</sup>; EX.28<sup>4</sup>; EX.27<sup>10</sup>; EX.30<sup>13</sup>; NUM.31<sup>10</sup>;  
DEUT.33<sup>19</sup>. See, ch. Rashi and Jonathan's Targum on the  
Prophets. In DEUT.19<sup>5</sup> Rashi supports Onkelos from  
Jonathan's Targum.
56. See Rashi who quotes the Targum on PSALMS GEN.31<sup>40</sup>.
57. It also appears that Rashi has seen some texts of Ps.  
Jonathan and possibly of Neofiti. See ch. "Rashi and Ps.  
Jonathan Targum".

58. cf. Rashi GEN.38<sup>2</sup>; GEN.43<sup>20</sup>; GEN.49<sup>25</sup>; EX.2<sup>10</sup>; EX.3<sup>19</sup>; EX.7<sup>11</sup>; EX.13<sup>19</sup>; EX.14<sup>27</sup>; EX.15<sup>4</sup>; EX.18<sup>26</sup>; LEV.19<sup>16</sup>; NUM.5<sup>2</sup>; DEUT.5<sup>18</sup>.
59. cf. Rashi GEN.43<sup>18</sup>; EX.3<sup>19</sup>; DEUT.3<sup>4</sup>; DEUT.5<sup>19</sup>.
60. Rashi and Rabbi A. Ibn Ezra <sup>on this verse</sup> present the most vivid contrast between the French schools and their Spanish counterpart.
61. See chs. Veneration and Idealization of the Patriarchs - where this subject is dealt at length.
62. See E.M. Lifshits, Rashi, op.cit. p.173 ff; M.Liber, Rashi, op.cit. pp.131-134; ibid ch.XI, pp.206-207 and ch.XII, p.220.
63. Rashi GEN.49<sup>24</sup> - ואונקלוס... תוספת הוא ולא מלשון העברית שבמקרא
64. Rashi EX.16<sup>14</sup> - וכגר עתרגא אונקלוס, תוספת הוא על לשון העברית, ואין לו תיבה בפסוק.
65. cf. Rashi GEN.49<sup>11</sup> - אמר' - ואונקלוס תרגמו במלך המשיח... וצוד -  
- אמר' - ואונקלוס תרגמו בפנים אמר' - cf.also Rashi GEN.49<sup>12</sup>.
- Commentators on the Targum have indeed shown that in many places Onkelos contains two or three interpretations in one single verse.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

66. cf. Rashi NUM.24<sup>14</sup> - אשר יעשה העם - מקרא קצר הוא זה .  
והתרגום מפרש קוצר העברי .

Sometimes without saying that the verse is elliptical Rashi implies as much by quoting Onkelos' Targum, e.g. GEN.41<sup>56</sup> - ויפתח יוסף את כל אשר בהם - כתרגומו די בהון ציבורא -  
"Understand it as the Targum renders it: Joseph opened all the [storehouses] in which there was corn".

Onkelos and Rashi are concerned to account for the fact that - בהם - (masc) has no antecedent - it cannot refer to - ערי'ם - (feminine). This has prompted one modern suggestion that - בהם - is a verb and could be read - בָּהֶם - with the suggested meaning "tied up" (cf. Hebrew - (בהמה) Arabic - اَبْتَلَه). See Mandelkern Concordance (היכל הקדש) Leipsig, 1896, p.166.

67. Rashi - השיב על כן - פרעה וכך.. הרי מקרא קצר לשון ולא פירש -  
מי השיב לפי שאין צריך לפרש מי העיב, מי עבדו להשיב והוא  
פרעה וכן דרך כל מקראות קצרים וכך -

R. Loewe suggests that Rashi may be also obliquely contradicting an attempt to refer - העיב - to Joseph, in the sense of "he represented me as being restored" which makes good sense - כאשר פתר לנו (כלומר יוסף) -  
כן היה אותי השיב (כלומר יוסף) ואותו תלה .

He - (Joseph) represented in his interpretation as due to be hanged. This interpretation is not far-fetched

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

67. (cont'd).

and in fact Ps. Jonathan appears to support it:-

והוה היכמא דפשר לנא כדן הוה, יתי אותיב במיליה על  
סדר שימושי.

The word - במיליה - means (בדבריו של יוסף שפטר את החלום) that by his interpretation of the dream he (Joseph) restored the Butler. (cf. - פירוש יונתן -).

68. See Nahmanides who suggests that Onkelos is alluding to the midrashic interpretation, namely that Moses taught the Israelites the relevant laws of each festival.

ורבוינו דרשו מלמד שהיה משה אומר הלכות פסח  
בפסח, והלכות עצרת בעצרת... ואונקלוס גם הוא נתכוון  
לזה שאמר ומליל משה ית סדרי מוצריא ואלפינון ובא...

69. For further references with regard to elliptical verses, cf. Rashi GEN.4<sup>15</sup>; GEN.13<sup>6</sup>; GEN.29<sup>2</sup>; GEN.39<sup>14</sup>; GEN.41<sup>49</sup>; GEN.48<sup>1</sup>; GEN.48<sup>2</sup>; EX.10<sup>5</sup>; EX.10<sup>11</sup>; EX.22<sup>22</sup>; EX.32<sup>32</sup>; NUM.8<sup>4</sup>; NUM.14<sup>24</sup>; NUM.24<sup>14</sup>; NUM.35<sup>25</sup>. See also Rashi in JOS.7<sup>15</sup>; JUDG.5<sup>5</sup>; I SAM.13<sup>8</sup>; II SAM.5<sup>8</sup>; JER.29<sup>12</sup>; ZECH.9<sup>13</sup>; ESTHER 1<sup>18</sup>.

70. See N. Adler, Netinah Lager and A. Sperber. Perhaps, however, the text of Onkelos is correct, and he had a non-massoretic tradition which read:-  
בשרה אחר

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

71. cf. Onkelos, NUM.5<sup>19</sup> s.v - דַּחַת אִישׁ. See Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch.3 - Free Translation.
72. cf. ibid, ch.5 - Injection of Derash and Halacha in Onkelos' Targum.
73. cf. ibid, ch.4. Translation of Biblical Idioms into Aramaic.
74. cf. ibid, ch. 6. The Influence of Aramaic Language on the Hebrew.
75. A. Sperber, The Bible in Aramaic, Leiden, 1959.
76. See ibid, ch. 10. Rashi and the text of Onkelos.
77. ibid, ch.10, footnote 4.
78. See - מִקְרָאוֹת גְּדוּלוֹת - LEV. Vilna (שְׁנַת תַּרמ"ו), 1886, where several rules have been postulated with regard to Rashi's method in quoting Onkelos' Targum.



GENERAL INTRODUCTION

79. With the exception of the Book of Zechariah or to the "Song of Songs"- where he prefaced his comments with the principles underlying his exegesis.
80. See Midrashic Section, Rashi's Correlation to Peshat and Derash, Group E (f).
81. cf. GEN.9<sup>27</sup>; GEN.6<sup>6</sup>; GEN.46<sup>28</sup>.
82. cf. GEN.22<sup>2</sup>; GEN.49<sup>27</sup> <sup>Rashi</sup> sometimes/gives three interpretations and the middle one is from Onkelos' Targum, e.g. DEUT.32<sup>25</sup>.
83. L. Zunz - "Toledoth Rashi", p.3 - has rightly remarked that these rules are incorrect and no attention should be paid to them. *see footnote 78.*
84. cf. Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch.9. Onkelos and Hebrew Grammar.
85. See Introduction to the Midrashic Section.
86. See Midrashic Section, Groups A.B.C.D.E.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

87. cf. Midrashic Section, Group A.
88. Midrashic Section, Group B.
89. cf. EX.23<sup>3</sup> - לא תהיה אחרי רבים - ואונקלוס תרגם לא תמנע...  
 ולשון העברי לפי התרגום כך הוא נדרש...  
 EX.22<sup>2</sup> - אם זרחה השמש - ואונקלוס שתרגם... לקח לו שיטה  
 אחרת לומר שאם מצאיהו עדים...  
 See Halachic Section, Group C. note 6.
90. cf. Rashi EX.25<sup>29</sup> - ומנקיותיו - אבל אונקלוס שתרגם ומכילתיה  
 היה עונה בדברי האומר מנקיות הן סניפין.  
 However, Rashi does not always point to this fact.  
 cf. Rashi and Onkelos, GEN.13<sup>13</sup> and Bab. Tal. Sanh. p.109<sup>a</sup>.  
 See Halachic Section, Group F. infra 1.
91. See Midrashic Section, Group D.
92. IS.1<sup>4</sup> - נזר - is in fact not from - נזר - but is Niphal  
 of - נזר. cf. B.D.B. p.266.
93. cf. Midrash Hagadol, op. cit. p.859; GEN. Rabbah 98,20.  
 See Midrashic Section, Group A, note 14.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

94. cf. EX.Rabbah 1, 10; Midrash Hagadol EX, p.13.  
Preference for the Targum over the Midrash can further be seen in Rashi on GEN.19<sup>15</sup>; GEN.49<sup>22</sup> and Midrashic Section, Group A. cf. also Section, Rashi as Philologist, chs. 1 and 2.
95. cf. Rashi EX.9<sup>33</sup> - לא נתך - ומנחם בן סרוק חברו בחלק כהתוך כסף (יח. כב) - לשון יציקת מתכת. ורואה את דבריו כהרגיומו ויצק - ואדתיך, לצקת - לאתכא....  
See Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch.8. Rashi and Menachem.
96. cf. Rashi EX.14<sup>24</sup> - s.v - באשקורר. Rashi here rejects Menachem Ben Seruk's explanation. cf. also Rashi EX.3<sup>22</sup>.
97. cf. Rashi EX.3<sup>22</sup>; EX.2<sup>10</sup>.
98. cf. GEN.25<sup>3</sup> - והרגומו של אנקלוס אין לי ליישובו על לשון המקרא -  
cf. also GEN.18<sup>19</sup>; GEN.43<sup>18</sup>; GEN.20<sup>13</sup>.
99. cf. EX.10<sup>21</sup> - וימע - ואונקלוס תרגם לשון הסרה... אבל אין הדבור מיושב על ה' של וימע.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

100. cf. EX.15<sup>13</sup> - נהלת - ואונקלוס תרגם לשון נושא יסובל, ולא דקדק לפרש אמר לשון העב.  
cf. Rashi EX.6<sup>9</sup>.
101. cf. EX.15<sup>8</sup> - נערמו - אונקלוס תרגם לשון ערמיות, אך לשון צחות המקרא -
102. cf. EX.23<sup>27</sup> - cf. also והמתרגם וימתי ואקטל שוועה הוא  
NUM.20<sup>29</sup> s.v - כי גוע ; DEUT.32<sup>26</sup>.
103. cf. GEN.15<sup>11</sup> - הפגרים - פלגא - וכל המתרגם בן שוועה... ופגרים -  
- תרגומו בגליא לשון פיגול.

Rashi may be crediting Onkelos here with an error due to textual transmission of the Targum, but although - פיגול - occurs in Targum Jonathan EZ.6,13; I SAM. 17,46 it is not recorded from Onkelos in Kasowsky's concordance.

104. cf. DEUT.32<sup>26</sup> - מפאיהם - אשיתם פאיה... וכן חברו מנחם  
וישפותרים אותו כהרגובו, וחול רוגזי עליהן, ולא יתכן שאם  
בן היה לו לכתוב מפאיהם...

See Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch.9. Onkelos and Hebrew Grammar.

105. Lived in Toulouse (France) about the first half of the eleventh century. His book is often cited by Rashi under the title of "Yesod" (Foundation) a haggadic and mystical commentary.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

106. cf. Rashi DEUT.32<sup>24</sup> s.v - מן רעב - See Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch.6. The Influence of Aramaic Language on the Hebrew, note 14.
107. See Midrashic Section, Group B, note 11; also Veneration of Aaron and Priests, Group D. For further references where Rashi favours the midrashic interpretations to that of Onkelos, see Midrashic Section, Group B, notes 5 and 6. cf. also Rashi DEUT.33<sup>3</sup> s.v - כל  
 כר טעו-אונקלוס תרגם מה שתרגם - GEN.20<sup>13</sup> ; קדשיו בידך -  
 Rashi NUM.23<sup>23</sup> - ואונקלוס לא תרגם כן
108. See Midrashic Section, Group E (e). Rashi and Derash.
109. Nahmanides and Ibn Ezra also take it in this sense.
110. It appears that Onkelos takes it from the root - מאס -  
 "to despise". - See N. Adler, Netinah-Lager; Ps.  
 Jonathan and Neofiti read:- רברבטן מכלח טין -  
 -i.e. taskmasters.
111. cf. Onkelos, EX.27<sup>19</sup>.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

112. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti are in line with Rashi: - **לֹס כִּי** -
113. cf. EX.32<sup>29</sup> - where Rashi explains the text differently from Onkelos. Again, Rashi GEN.13<sup>13</sup>; GEN.37<sup>36</sup> - s.v - **הַטְּבָחִים** (see Nahmanides who supports Onkelos) GEN.36<sup>24</sup> - s.v - **רֵימִים**. See Nahmanides; N. Adler, Netinah-Lager.
114. cf. EX.6<sup>9</sup> - **וְאִין הַמִּדְרָשׁ מִתִּישָׁב אַחֲרֵי הַמִּקְרָא ... לִכְךָ אֵינִי אוֹמֵר** - **יִתִּישָׁב הַמִּקְרָא עַל פְּשׁוּטוֹ דְּבַר דְּבוּר עַל אִפְנֵי וְהַרְעָה תִּדְרַשׁ וְכֹל**.  
cf. Rashi GEN.3<sup>8</sup>; GEN.3<sup>22</sup>; GEN.3<sup>24</sup>; GEN.4<sup>8</sup>; GEN.6<sup>3</sup>; GEN.6<sup>9</sup>; GEN.49<sup>22</sup>. See too, Table One. Isaac Avinery in his dictionary - **מִלּוֹן פִּירוּשֵׁי רַשִׁי**, Tel Aviv, 1949, p.14 - claims that in 300 places Rashi disagrees with the midrashic interpretations of the Rabbis. Nahmanides GEN.8<sup>4</sup> - who contests the midrashic interpretation, makes it clear that it was the precedent of Rashi that makes him feel entitled so to proceed: **"אֲבָל כִּיֹּן שָׂרַע"**  
**מִדְּקִדֵּךְ בַּמִּקְוֹת אַחֲרֵי מִדְּרָשׁ הַהֲגֵדוֹת וְעוֹרֵךְ לְבִאֵר פְּשָׁטִי הַמִּקְרָא, הִרְעָה אוֹתוֹ לַעֲשׂוֹת כֵּן, כִּי עֲבָרִים פָּנַע לְתוֹרָה.**
115. cf. Rashi EX.2<sup>5</sup> **אֲמַתָּה - וְרִבּוּתֵינוּ דָּרְשׁוּ לָשׁוֹן יָד אֲבָל לְפִי הַדְּקוּק לָשׁוֹן הַקָּדָשׁ הָיָה לוֹ לְהִנָּקֵד אֲמַתָּה דְּגוּשָׁה**.  
It is Rabbi Judah's exegesis that - **אֲמַתָּה** - (literally cubit) means "her hand" but Rabbi Nehemiah understood it as Rashi does (i.e. **אֲמַתָּה**). See Bab.Tal. Sot.12<sup>b</sup>. The Targum follows Rabbi Judah - **וְאִשְׁתֵּי יָדֵי אֲמַתָּה**.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

115. (cond'd).

cf. Saadia Gaon in his commentary in Arabic -  
 -ומרת דרעהא- quoted by Rabbi D. Kimhi, on the Torah;  
 cf. Ps. Jonathan. Ibn Ezra points out, however, that  
 the word -אמה- is only found as the name of a  
 measure i.e. cubit never as referring to the arm  
 itself.

116. cf. Rashi DEUT.32<sup>12</sup> - ואין עמן - ורבותינו דרשוהו על העתיד ,  
 וכן תרגם אונקלוס, ואני אומר דברי תוכחה הם וכו'.

117. See Weiss Dor Dor Vedorshav, IV, pp.324 and 327; ibid,II -  
 - תולדות רבי שלמה בר יצחק בית התלמוד - Vienna 1882,  
 pp. 165 ff.

NOTESINTRODUCTION TO HALACHIC SECTION

1. Regarding the conventional distinction between "Peshat and "Derash" see Midrashic Section, Group E (a,b,c,d,e); R. Loewe, The Plain Meaning of Scripture in Early Jewish Exegesis, pp. 155-167 and 167 f.
2. See Midrashic Groups.
3. See chs . Rashi as Philologist.
4. Whilst Rashi almost ignored Onkelos in halachic matters, the Spanish commentators such as Nahmanides quote him quite frequently and derive many "halachic points" from his interpretations, e.g. EX.22<sup>2</sup>; LEV.6<sup>3</sup>; LEV.11<sup>9</sup>; LEV.19<sup>32</sup>; LEV.20<sup>3</sup>; LEV.23<sup>40</sup>; LEV.23<sup>44</sup>; NUM.31<sup>23</sup>; DEUT.21<sup>16</sup>; DEUT.21<sup>14</sup>. The famous Spanish commentator on Alfasi, Rabbenu Nissim, also quotes Onkelos in Bab.Tal.Kid.32<sup>b</sup> with regard to LEV.19<sup>32</sup> and endeavours to reconcile his view with that of the Talmud. Again in Bab.Kid.9<sup>a</sup> Rabbenu Nissim quotes Onkelos on DEUT.23<sup>18</sup> (on : LEV 19<sup>32</sup> — Rashi does not comment on Onkelos). The famous Rab. Hai Gaon quotes Onkelos and derives laws from his expositions, e.g.NUM.6<sup>5</sup>. The Gaon holds that "scissors" fall under the same prohibition as - קצר - razor (therefore, it should not be used for cutting the hair) since Onkelos translates it by - קסר - "scissors". (See, however, Nahmanides "Torat Haadam", Mossad Harav Kook, Jerusalem, 1968 who argues



## 4. (cont'd).

with the Gaon). Maimonides also deduced several halachic matters from Onkelos' expositions, e.g. הלכות איסורי ביאה בגיגה - on DEUT.23<sup>18</sup>; again in - הלכות גטבה פ"ט. יא. - (Rabbi Abraham Ben David - (הראב"ד) - and Maggid Mishne state that Maimonides' source is Onkelos' Targum, EX.22<sup>2</sup>). cf. Maimonides - ספר המצוות, מצוות לא תעשה, מצוות קכח - where he quotes Onkelos, EX.12<sup>43</sup> - before the Mechilta's interpretation. The famous commentator on the Talmud Rabbenu Yom-Tov (הריטב"א) in Moed Katan 24<sup>a</sup> deduces from Onkelos' interpretation, LEV.13<sup>45</sup> - וְעַל עַפְפֹּה - that the "covering of the head" is biblical (מן התורה) (see Shulhan Aruch, V. Yore Dea, ch.386). Again, Rabbenu S. Ben Adereth (הרשב"א) quotes in his Responsium 164 Onkelos, GEN.25<sup>27</sup>. The Tosafoth likewise deduce laws from Onkelos' Targum, e.g. NUM.6<sup>3</sup> - MEN.44<sup>a</sup>. The Talmud itself quotes Onkelos' expositions e.g. EX.25<sup>5</sup> - SHAB.28<sup>a</sup>. It is difficult, however, to know whether - דמיתרגמין - is a reference to Onkelos as the same interpretation is given in Ps. Jonathan. Again, NUM.6<sup>4</sup> - NAZ.39<sup>a</sup>: - אמר רב יוסף כמאן - מיתרגמין מנורצין - Here Rab. Joseph definitely had in mind Onkelos and not Ps. Jonathan for the latter translates differently. On this subject, see P.Churgin - Targum Jonathan to the Prophets, in his introduction "The Historical Background", pp.9-20 with special attention to p.14. See Halachic Section Group E. note 25

NOTESGROUP A (1)

1. See this Section, Group C.
2. cf. Ps. Jonathan: - די"אור דמא דאנשא בטהדין דינא סמי"בין ליה קטול -  
 Neofiti, however, translates: - כן דשפך אדמיה דבר נש על ידי בר -  
 נש ישפך אדמיה ארום בדמו מן קדם ה' ברא ית אדם.  
 Neofiti is in line with current Halacha for the words -  
 על ידי בר נש - mean : by a single witness.
3. - ואשכח רבי יעקב בר אחא דהוה כתיב בספר אגדתא דבי רב  
 בן נח נהרג בד"ן אחד ובפך אחד.  
 cf. Maimonides - הלכות מלכים פ"ט. יד.  
 cf. also GEN. Rabbah 34,14 - שופך - אמר רבי חנינא כולהם  
 כהלכות בני נח בפך אחד בד"ן אחד ובלא התראה וכו'...  
 cf. Tanh.(Levin-Epstein) Shophetim, 1,p.110; Midrash  
 Hagadol, GEN. p.184; Palest. Tal. Kid. ch.1.Halacha 1.
4. ed. Weiss, Vienna 1865, Parasha 11. It may, however, be  
 that Onkelos is excluding "gentiles" and not "proselyte  
 victims". See S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, p.97.  
 N. Adler, Netinah-Lager believes that the word - ישראל -  
 is an interpolation in Onkelos' Targum by a later writer.  
 This is unlikely since Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti in-  
 corporate this word in their Targumim.  
 The fact that the Mechilta felt compelled to include  
 "proselyte victims" - shows that at one time there was

NOTESGROUP A (1)

a school of thought which believed that the proselytes should be excluded. This school of thought is portrayed by the Targumim.

5. cf. this Section, Group A (11). Also this Section, Group C. note 7.
6. Onkelos is supported by the division of - מתנחלים -  
in the word - ח"ב .
7. cf. Palest. Tal. B.Kam. ch.1, Halacha 2.
8. Ps. Jonathan follows Onkelos: - אין ביהדיא ... עד חמור עד אימר -  
cf. also Neofiti. - כד הינון ג'מין על חד תרין ישרא
9. Also in EX.34<sup>26</sup> and DEUT.14<sup>21</sup>.
10. cf. Mechilta (ed. M. Friedmann), Parasha 20; Maimonides -  
הלכות במאכלות מסוררות פ"א.
11. See Rabbi H. Di-Silva in his commentary "Peri Chadash",  
V. Yore-Dea, ch.87, who remarks that Onkelos is against  
the traditional interpretation.

NOTESGROUP A (1)

12. The Pentateuch with Rashi's Commentary. N.E.B. does not translate according to the sequence of the text.
13. Rashi reads: - *ומעשיו - רבתי התורה חמשות הדבה לקרן אחת*  
*שאם כפר בקומש ונשבץ והודה חוזר ומביא קומש על מותו קומש,*  
*ובן מוסיף והולך עד שיתמעט הקרן וכו'...*
14. cf. also Bab. Kam. 65<sup>b</sup>.
15. However, A. Sperber, The Bible in Aramaic has - *ומעשוריו* ;  
 also, Oheb. Ger. p.58 - *ומעשוריו*. This of course would  
 correspond with tradition. Kittel Biblia Hebraica,<sup>3</sup>  
 notes 53 Manuscripts reading - *חמשיהו* - (singular).  
*see, Gesenius, Heb. Grammar 91 l.*
16. This is the version in A. Sperber.
17. *ובדגים כל שיש לו סנפיר וקשקשת, רבי יהודה אומר שני קשקשין וסנפירא*  
 According to - *תנא קמא* - one of each is enough, and  
 Rabbi Judah's *accepted* opinion is that two scales and  
 one fin are needed. The accepted opinion is that of - *תנא*  
 - *(הלכות מאכלות אסורות פ"א גמ')* cf. Maimonides - *קמא* -  
*cf. Shulchan* - *א"פלו אין בו אלא סנפיר אחת וקשקשת אחת*.  
 Aruch and Tur. V. Yore-Dea, ch.83; Siphra 78; Tos'fta  
 Hul. ch.3. See, too, Maggid Mishneh *הלכות מאכלות אסורות פ"א כה*.  
 It is worth noting that Onkelos is not in accordance with  
 Rabbi Judah either, since the latter holds that one fin is  
 enough.

NOTESGROUP A (1)

18. This is the N.E.B. translation and it appears they take -הלאה- and -הלאה- as one kind. The Pentateuch with Rashi's commentary translates the text in DEUT.<sup>14</sup><sup>13</sup> as follows: "The glede and the kite and the vulture after its kind".
19. cf. Midrash Aggadah, v.2, p.192.
20. N.E.B. translation and the Heb. means "husband".
21. Siphra Parasha 1,10 - לא ישמא - מה תל'... יכול אף לאשתו -  
 ישמא בין כשרה בין פסולה תל' לא ישמא... יש בעל  
 שמשמא, ויש בעל שאין משמא.  
 cf. too Ps. Jonathan; Bab.Yeb.22<sup>b</sup>; Maimonides -  
 - הלכות אבל פ"ב. ע.
22. See Nahmanides on verse 1, who explains Onkelos.
23. Neofiti reads - לא ישמא רבה דבעמיה - On the margin of Neofiti - כהנה רבה - is inserted.
24. See Bab.Yeb.p.70<sup>a</sup>; Siphra Parasha 6,3: - "וורץ אין לה - אין לי -  
 אלא בנה בתה ובת בנה ובת בתה ובן בתה, בן בת בתה  
 מנן תל' וורץ אין לה."  
 Maimonides - הלכות תחומות פ"ג. יג. - Maimonides, Commentary on the Mishna, Yeb.ch.7, Mishna 7.

NOTESGROUP A (1)

25. Siphra; Bab.Tal.Sanh.84<sup>b</sup>, 85<sup>b</sup>.
26. cf. N.E.B. "Whoever strikes a beast and kills it shall make restitution, but whoever strikes a man and kills him shall be put to death".
27. Rashi - השסוקה - בריה היא שיש לה שני גבין ושתי עוראורר  
cf. Lekah-Tov; Midrash Aggadah, Buber, v.2. p.192;  
Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. p.293.
28. Neofiti does not follow the traditional view: - לחוד יד  
אילין לא תאכלון מן מסקי גרריתיה ומן סריקי פרסתיה דסליקה וכו'..  
See further Group A (II) The Targumim Contain Pre-tannaitic tradition.
29. cf. also Bab.Ket.46<sup>a</sup>: - "אמר רבי אבהו למרנו ויסרו מווסרו על  
מוציא שם רע (רב' כב. יח.).
30. Siphre 291; Bab.Yeb.101<sup>b</sup> and 106<sup>b</sup>; Maimonides: - הלכורר  
Midrash Tannaim, p.167; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT.p.566.  
*See Halachic Section Group E. note 39.*
31. See Rashi, GEN.32<sup>21</sup>.

NOTESGROUP A (II)

1. See P. Kahle, The Cairo Geniza, (2nd. ed.1959), pp.205-8; J. Heinemann, Early Halacha in the Palestinian Targumim, J.J.S.25, 1974, p.117.
2. See G. Vermes, The Cambridge History of the Bible, 1, 1970, p.214 ff; M. McNamara, The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch, Rome,1966,p.134 ff.
3. The Pentateuch with Rashi's Commentary.
4. Neofiti reads: - כי יבער - אנוש "קד גבר חקל או כרם וישלח  
'קידתא . . . בית שפר חקליה ובית שפר כרמיה ישלח
5. Bab.Kam.p.2<sup>b</sup>; Rashi EX.22<sup>4</sup>. The word - ושלח - comes under the category of - רגל - the second - ובער - under that of - נזקי העין.
6. H. Albeck, הלכה מ'צונה בתרגומי א"י ובהגדרה - Jubilee Volume - B.M. Levin, ed. J.L. Fishman,1940, pp.93-104.
7. op. cit. p. 117.

NOTESGROUP A (II)

8. cf. Palest. Tal. Meg. ch. 4, Halacha 10, p. 65 -  
 "תורגמן שהוא קומד לפני חכם אינו רשאי לא לשנות ולא  
 לכתוב ולא להוסיף אלא אם כן היה אביו וכך..."  
 cf. Maimonides, Yad: - הלכות תלמוד תורה פ"ד ג. -  
 Rabbi A. Ben David; Bab. Ber. 45<sup>a</sup>; Bab. Kid. 31<sup>b</sup>.
  
9. cf. Mishna, Meg. 4, 6.
  
10. cf. Palest. Tal. Meg. 4, Halacha 10. See supra, note 8.
  
11. See Maimonides, Yad: - הלכות תלמוד תורה פ"ד ג. -
  
12. ch. 4, 9.
  
13. - "האומר ומזרעך לא תתן להעביר למלך, ומזרעך לא תתן  
 לאעברא בארמיותא משתקין אותו בניי' פה."
  
14. See Bab. Meg. 25<sup>b</sup> where the Meturgeman was always guided  
 by the Haham: - "מצעה ראובן נקרא ולא מתרגם. ומעשה  
 בר"ם בן גמליאל שהלך לכבול, והיה קורא חזן בית הכנסת  
 ויהי בשכון ישראל ואמר לו למתורגמן אל תתרגם אלא  
 אחרון ושיבחרו חכמים."
  
15. For a digest of the basic rules, see Maimonides, Yad. -  
 הלכות תפילה פ"י יד.  
 Shulhan Aruch, O. Ch. ch. 145  
 and 285.



NOTESGROUP A (II)

16. See Bab.Shab.115<sup>a</sup> with regard to the Targum to the Book of Job.
17. See this Section, Group A. I. Also Group C, note 7.
18. See this Section, Group B.
19. cf. N.E.B. who takes it also as Neofiti: "When a man burns a field or a vineyard and lets the fire spread so that it burns another man's field, he shall make restitution from his own field according to the yield expected; and if the whole field is laid waste, he shall make restitution from the best part of his own field or vineyard".
20. See Bab.Kam p.2<sup>b</sup>.
21. If the author meant that they used to hang the body after the strangulation, this too, is against the Halacha since only the - נִסְקָלִין - used to be hanged. See Mishna, <sup>Sanh.</sup> Sanh. 7,4.
22. See י.צ. מלמד - "לִתְרַגּוּם מִגִּילת רוּחַ" (לכב' פ'. חורגין ספר הענה) בר אילן א. הוצאת קרית ספר  
Jerusalem, 1963, pp.190-194.  
Rab Hai Gaon's statement (see Genizah studies in memory of S. Shechter II New York, 1929, p.86) that the Targum of the Hagiographa is "a Targum of Laymen" (תְּרַגּוּם שֶׁל כְּתוּבִים) - or better "unauthorised" Targum) is further support to this theory.

NOTESGROUP A (II)

23. Sanh. ch.7,2.

24. Most interesting to note that Rabbi M. Sopher (the famous Talmudist known as חתם סופר -) believed that the author of this Targum was a Sadducee. See לשכת סופרים - לאבן העזר סימן יז. סעיף מג.  
cf. also Melamed, op. cit. p. 191.

1. cf. Mechilta, Parasha 17; Bab.Pes.5<sup>a</sup>; Ps. Jonathan interprets - שבעת יומין פטירא תיכלון ברע מפלגות  
יומא דמקמי חגא תבטלון חמר ---
2. On verse 16, Onkelos takes - ולטוטפורת - to mean Tefillin - ולתפילין בין עיניך .
3. cf. Rabbi S. Ben Meir.
4. Bab.Tal. Menah. 36<sup>b</sup>; Irub.96<sup>a</sup>.
5. Onkelos is obscure and it is difficult to assess whether he is like Rabbi Akiva or Rabbi Jose Hagalili. See Adler- Netinah-Lager. Ps. Jonathan follows Rabbi Jose Hagalili - ותנטור ית קיימא דגא דתפילין ,  
לזימנא דחוי לה ביומי צובדא ולא בשבתא ובמועד"א  
וביממא ולא בליליא -  
Neofiti reads - ותטרוין ית קיימיה דאורייתא הדד  
בימנא מן עדן יומין לעדן יומין -
6. Mechilta Bab.Tal.Kid.15<sup>a</sup>. See Midrashic Section, Group E (a) Origin and Development of Halacha(footnote 3); Also Midrashic Section, Group E (f) footnote 5.

GROUP B

7. Ps. Jonathan translates in accordance with tradition:-

וְהָיָה לִי עֶבֶד פֶּלַח עֵר יוֹבֵלָא

Neofiti translates literally:- עֶבֶד מִשְׁתַּעֲבָד -

לְעָל cf. Samuel Ben Meir. See Ibn Ezra who rejects his interpolation. *interpretation.*

8. Rashi - - מוֹת יוֹמֵת - בַּחֲנֹק -cf. Mechilta, Parasha 5.

9. cf. Mechilta, Parasha 5.

10. Bab.Tal.Sanh. 66<sup>a</sup>; Siphra LEV.20<sup>9</sup> (ch.9 - Malbim - ), Mechilta, Parasha 5.

11. Neofiti EX.21<sup>15-16</sup> translates literally. There is, however, no translation for verse 17.

12. Mechilta, Bab. Tal.Sanh.52<sup>b</sup>, Baba Batra 50<sup>a</sup>. cf. Ps.  
Jonathan:- וְאֵרֹם יִמִּי גִבֹּר יֵת עֲבָדֶיהָ... וְיָמוֹת בִּהְיוֹא יוֹמָא תַחֲוֵת  
יְדִיהָ יַעֲדֵנָא וְיַתְדֵן דִּין קִטִּילָהּ סִיפָא.

13. See Bab.Tal.Baba Kama 83<sup>b</sup>; 84<sup>a</sup>; Mechilta, Parasha 8;  
Ibn Ezra; Nahmanides; Maimonides: - הַלְכוֹת חֹבֵל וּמוֹזֵק בְּא.ו. -  
See P. Churgin, Targum Jonathan to the Prophets, p.17 -  
who remarks that Onkelos is against the Halacha.

GROUP B

## 13. (cont'd)

In Bab.Tal.Baba Kam. 84<sup>a</sup>, Rabbi Eliezer states that "eye for eye" - *מקט* - (i.e. literally) and from the Talmud Meg. 3<sup>a</sup> we learn that Onkelos was Rabbi Eliezer's disciple.

14. Bab.Tal.Sanh.15<sup>b</sup> and Mechilta Parasha 10.15. Bab. Sanh. 15<sup>b</sup> - *על רציחתו אתה הורגו ואי אתה הורגו על רציחת שורו.*16. Onkelos:- *וגם מריה יתקטל*17. *- ולא ידעתי טעם לדברי אונקלוס*18. Mechilta Parasha 10:- *ונתן פדיון-דמי נזק דברי רבי שמעאל, רבי עקיבא אומר דמי מו'ק.*19. However, in Bab.Tal.Baba Kam. 27<sup>a</sup>, 40<sup>a</sup>, there is a different version. The same argument is between the Rabbis and Rabbi Ishmael Ben Beroka.20. Mechilta Parasha 17. Bab.Tal.Sanh.67<sup>a</sup>.

GROUP B

21. Rashi himself failed to quote the argument between Rabbi Ishmael and Rabbi Akiva. Ps. Jonathan translates literally:- "עמי בע ישראל כל עביר חרשיתא לא תק"מון". cf. Neofiti.
22. Mechilta Parasha 17; Bab.Tal.Sanh.54<sup>b</sup>; Siphra LEV.20<sup>16</sup>; Bab. Yeb. 4<sup>a</sup>.
23. Ps. Jonathan reads:- כל יושבב עם בעירא באמלות מבטן  
יתקטלון.
24. Ps. Jonathan, however, explains that he will be killed by the "sword" - יתקטל בס"פא. This corresponds with the Bab.Tal.Sanh. 60<sup>a</sup>.
25. See Siphre NUM.19<sup>12-13</sup> (Malbim 41, 45):- על שומארת .  
מקדש וקדשיו הבתוב מדבר וענוש כרר
26. cf. Onkelos, LEV.17<sup>4</sup>; LEV.17<sup>10-14</sup>; LEV.18<sup>29</sup>; LEV.20<sup>17-18</sup>.
27. See Adler Netinah-Lager. In Siphra, ch.9, however, we read:- ולא ימותו בשמאתם-הרי זה עונש - without definition of the penalty.

GROUP B

28. Ps. Jonathan Palest.Targ. and Neofiti follow the accepted tradition. See this Group, note 9.
29. cf. Bab.Tal.Archin 31<sup>a</sup>, Mechilta, (EX.13<sup>10</sup>) - Parasha 17.
30. cf. Onkelos, EX.13<sup>10</sup> who translates - מימ'ת ומימ'ת - by - מומן לומן -. See further the following note 17.
31. Bab.Tal.Sanh. 84<sup>a</sup>.
32. With regard to a stranger who enters the Temple whilst he is unclean, see this Group, note 15:-
33. ואמר עוד אונקלוס בבבליק והזר הקרב ואת "יתקטל" כי היה  
 10 בר כרבי עקיבא שאמר הור עשימש במקדש רבי עקיבא אומר בשני .  
 Although there is a rule that wherever the death penalty is mentioned in Scripture without being precisely defined, "strangulation" is intended (cf. Rashi EX.21<sup>16</sup>) nevertheless, Nahmanides' argument that Onkelos holds like Rabbi Akiva, is not convincing for two reasons:  
 a) because there is an argument (Bab.Tal.Sanh. 84<sup>a</sup>) between two Tannaim whether Rabbi Akiva holds "Hanek" - "strangulation" - or - "Sekilah" - stoning - to be applicable to this case.

GROUP B

33. (cont'd).

b) in EX.21<sup>17</sup> - "And he that curseth his father or his mother shall surely be put to death" - the Rabbis interpret (see this Group, note 7) that sentence of death here means - "Sekila" - stoning - and/- "Hanek" - <sup>not</sup> "strangulation". But here, too, Onkelos translates literally - וְדִלּוּט אֲבוֹהֵי וְתַקְטִילָא יִתְקַטֵּל - despite the fact that the whole talmudic tradition agree that "Sekila" is meant.

34. Siphre, 179 (Malbim ed). cf. Ber. 9<sup>a</sup>.

35. - וּבְשִׁלַּח - זֶהוּ צִלִּי אֵשׁ שֶׁאֵף הוּא קָרוֹי בְּשׁוּל -

36. cf. EX.12<sup>9</sup>; Bab.Tal. Pes. 74<sup>a</sup>.

37. Mechilta Parasha 17; Pes.120<sup>a</sup>; cf. also Rashi on EX.12<sup>15</sup>; Bab. Men. 66<sup>a</sup>.

Siphre  
38. cf./Piska 156 - יְקוּם עַל שֵׁם אֲחִין - לְנַחֵלָה, נֹאמֵר  
כֹּאן שֶׁ אֲחִיו וְנֹאמֵר לְהֵלֵן עַל שֵׁם אֲחִיהֶם יִקְרְאוּ בְּנַחֲלֹתָם  
(בְּרֵא' כוּח. ו.) מִה שֶׁ הָאֲמֹר לְהֵלֵן לְנַחֲלָה אֵף שֶׁ הָאֲמֹר

כֹּאן לְנַחֲלָה.  
cf. too, Bab.Tal.Yeb.24<sup>a</sup>; Maimonides - הַלְכוֹת נַחֲלָה פ"ג. ז.  
Midrash Aggadah, DEUT. p. 563.



GROUP B

39. Ps. Jonathan, however, follows the tradition.  
In verses 5 and 6 he adds the word - באחסנרדא -  
Neofiti translates literally.
40. cf. Bab.Tal.Baba Kama 28<sup>a</sup> - וקצתה את כפה - ממון
41. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti translate also literally.  
Perhaps the Targumim follow the first tannaitic  
opinion in Siphra Piska 161: - וקצתה את כפה-מלמד -  
שאתה חייב להצילו. מנן שאם אין אתה יכול להצילו  
בכפה הצלו בנפשה תל לא תחוס צינך.  
cf. too, Maimonides - הלכות רוצח פ"א. ז.  
and Rabbi Abraham Ben David.

NOTESHALACHA - GROUP C

1. Bech.ch.6, Mishna 2; Bab.Bech.38<sup>a</sup>; Maimonides - הלכור - ביאר מקדש פ"ז. ה.
2. ibid, ch.6, Mishna 2.
3. Maimonides in his commentary on this Mishna explains that - חלון - is a piece of flesh which intersects the pupil of the eye - והוא שצומח בעין בשר מותר ומשך - עד שחופה קצת משחור העין -
4. See Rabbi Abraham Ben David who explains in his commentary to the Siphra that Onkelos is contrary to the interpretation of the Rabbis.
5. See Bab.Git.45<sup>a</sup> where this interpretation is given in the name of Rabbi Ahi Ben Josiah. See Maimonides - הלכות עבדים פ"ח. י.
6. Nahmanides follows Onkelos (without quoting him) that the text speaks about a gentile slave whose master is a heathen and then he quotes the interpretation of Rabbi Ahi Ben Josiah in Git. 45<sup>a</sup>. See also Ibn Ezra. Mizrachi explains the wording of the Targum - עבד עממין - to mean - עבד ישראל הנמכר לעכו"ם - "an Israelite slave whose master is a heathen". This is a forced

GROUP C

6. (cont'd).

interpretation. See Maimonides - פ"ח.יא. - הלכות עבדים ;  
Halachic Section, Group D, note 11.

7. Keri.9; Yeb.46<sup>b</sup>; see Rabbi Abraham Ben Maimon (ed. Wiesen-  
berg, London 1959) that Moses sprinkled the  
blood on the head of - LXX renders ראשי העם -  
"Moses took the blood and scattered it towards the  
people".

8. - רבי אליעזר אומר הו גר דיליף מאבות. רבי יהושע באבות  
שבילה הו. מנא ליה מהכא, ויקח משה את הדם... וגמרי  
דאין קומה בלא שבילה.

9. *ibid.*

10. The Talmud, however, does not explain the text in  
question according to Rabbi Eliezer, but perhaps  
Rabbi Eliezer would have explained it like Onkelos,  
viz. that the sprinkling was done on to the altar.  
See Tosafoth Yeshamim, Zeb. 46<sup>b</sup> which interprets it  
likewise; cf. Adler in Netinah-Lager.

11. Bab.Sanh. 2<sup>a</sup>.

GROUP C

12. Rashi - ואונקלוס תרגם לא תתחנץ מלחלפא מה דבעינך על דינא -
13. On this particular text Rashi, dissatisfied with the interpretation of the Rabbis as well as that of Onkelos, adds his own interpretation which he considers fitted well with the plain meaning of the text: - ואט אומר לייטבו -  
- See Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch.10, Rashi and the text of Onkelos, note 25.
14. cf. Bab.Sanh. 54<sup>b</sup>; Siphre Piska 126.
15. P. Churgin - Targum Jonathan to the Prophets - p.17 - remarked that Onkelos on DEUT.23<sup>18</sup> is against the accepted Halacha.
16. Nahmanides has this to say: - ונראה שאין מדרשם כדבריו -  
- Maimonides also quotes Onkelos' interpretation - ואונקלוס -  
הלכות איסורי ביאה פ"ב. יג. See Rashi - Bab.Kid.69, who explains the discussion of the Talmud according to Onkelos; Mine Targuma by I. Berlin.
17. Rashi - ואונקלוס תרגם לא תהא מתתא מבנת ישראל לגבר עבדא שאף זו מופקרת לבגילת זנות מאחר שאין קידושין תופסין לו בה. ולא יסב גברא מבני ישראל מתתא אמה שאף הוא נעשה קדש על ידה... שאין קידושין תופסין לו בה.

GROUP C

18. See Mechilta Parasha 13; Rashi - הרי זה משל אדם ברור -  
 לך הדבר שיש לו שלוש עמך בשמש... כך פשוט לך שאינו  
 בא להרוג מפילו יעמוד... כגון אב החותר לגנוב ממון הבן.  
 cf. Bab.Sanh.73.
19. - אדם צינא דסהדיא נפלת צלוהי דמא ליה, ואונקלוס לקח לו  
 שיטה אחרת.  
 The Mechilta offers the same interpretation as that of  
 the Targum מה להלן (נערה המאורסה) היו לה מושיעין הימנו והרגת  
 חייבת אף כאן (הגנב) היו לו מושיעין הימנו והרגו חייב.  
 The word - מושיעין (deliverers) might in this  
 context be understood to mean "witnesses". See  
 Nahmanides: הלכות גטבה פ"ט י"א. - see section  
 Rashi as Philologist ch. 4 note 5.
20. See Maimonides: - הלכות גטבה פ"ט י"א. - who incorporated  
 Onkelos' opinion into his Halachot. Rabbi A. Ben David  
 suggests that Maimonides' source is the Targum in question.
21. Rashi - אל שערך - המתרגם אל שערך לתרגם ביד  
 דרך שושה... שכן שנתנו אל שערך זה שער שערב בו וכא...  
 22. Siphre Piska 149; Bab.Tal. Ket. 45<sup>b</sup>.

GROUP C

23. Ps. Jonathan follows Onkelos: - ותפקין ית גברא ההוא או ית -  
 ית אנתכא ההוא דעברו ית פתגמא בישא הדין לתרץ בית  
 דיטכון וכו' -

It appears that Onkelos and Ps. Jonathan had a different traditional Halacha than that of the Babylonian Talmud. At any rate Onkelos is not in error since the "Sages" in Palest. Tal. Sanh. (ch.6 Halacha 1) Interpret like him: - "ורבנ אמרי בשעריך בשער שטודן בו. אתה אומר כן מואינו אלא בשער שנמצא בו נאמר כאן בשעריך ונאמר להלן והוצאת את האיש ההוא מואת האשה ההיא אל שעריך, מה שעריך האמור להלן שער שטודן בו אף שעריך האמור כאן שער שטודן בו."

cf. also Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. p.383: - אל שעריך - אלו  
 בתי דינין -

Neofiti, however, does not follow the other Targumim: -

ותרון ית גוברא ההוא או ית אתתה ההיא דעברו ית  
 פתגמא בישה דין לגו קור"כון ית גוברא וכו' -

See this Section, Group A (II). Also Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch.10 - Rashi and the text of Onkelos, note 34.

24. This is in fact the interpretation of Rabbi Ishmael, as Rashi mentions immediately afterwards: - והשיאו את עצמם -  
 יטענו עון באכלם את קדשיהם שהבדלו לשם דרומה וכו' -  
 cf. Siphre, (ed. Malbim), NUM. 6<sup>13</sup>, Piska 124.

GROUP C

25. - ואונקלוס שתרגם במיכליהון בסומבא שלא לצורך תרגמו כן  
See Nahmanides.

26. While Rashi, here, rejects Onkelos in Bab.Sanh.90<sup>b</sup>  
he interprets the statement of Rabbi Eliezer Ben Jacob  
according to Onkelos' interpretation: - רבי יוחנן אומר  
הנותן תרומה לעם הארץ גורם לו מיתה. רבי אליעזר  
בן יעקב תנא אף משיאו עון אשמה שנאמר באוכלם  
וכו... רש"י - באוכלם את קדשיהם - ומתרגמין במיכליהון  
בסומבא ית קדשיהון.

## NOTES

HALACHA - GROUP D

1. - לא יוכל לתבוע שיתן לו חטכר והוא יעשה בו דברים אחרים  
רק ירפא...
2. Baba Kamma 85<sup>a</sup> - "ואם אמר לי היאך הב לי לידי ואנא מסינא  
נפשי אל פועת בנפער ושקלת מינאי טפי"  
- הלכות חבל ומזיק פ"ב. יו. See too Maimonides:-
3. 1.e. - See Bab.Tal.Hul.102<sup>b</sup>. בשר מן החי
4. Hulin 102<sup>b</sup> - אמר רבי יוחנן ובשר בשדה - זה בשר מן החי  
cf. Maimonides:- See הלכות מאכלות אסורות פ"ד. י.  
Luzzatto - Oheb Ger, p.53 with regard to the different  
versions in Onkelos' Targum. See N. Adler, Netinah-Lager.
5. Mishpatim, Parasha 20; cf. Bab.Sanh. 7<sup>b</sup>.
6. cf. Pes. 118<sup>a</sup>; Makoth 23<sup>a</sup>; Shebuoth 31<sup>b</sup>:- כל המספר לשון  
הרע ראוי להשליכו לכלבים, שנאמר לכלב תשליכון אוזנו וכו'...  
וסמך ליה לא תשא שמע שוא.
7. The Pentateuch<sup>with</sup>/Rashi's commentary, N.E.B. does not  
translate the text literally.



GROUP D

8. 87<sup>b</sup>, cf. Rashi on EX.23<sup>18</sup>, Mechilta on EX.23<sup>18</sup>, Parasha 20; Meg. 20<sup>b</sup>; Siphra on LEV.6<sup>2</sup>. It is interesting to note that on EX.23<sup>18</sup> Rashi does not quote the Targum; Midrash Hagadol, EX. p.544 and p. 714; Maimonides:-  
הלכות קרבן פסח פ"א. ה.  
10 and 11.
9. Rashi:- בנמצאה - עמד בט מעיה, ונוצה לשון דבר המאס, וזהו שתרגם -  
אונקלוס באוכליה, וזהו מדרשו של אבא יוסי בן חנן שאמר -  
נוטל את הקרבן עמה.  
cf. Bab.Zeb.65<sup>b</sup>; Siphra Piska 84; Midrash Hagadol LEV.  
p. 53; Lekah-Tov, v.2. p.5; <sup>Rashi thus</sup> ~~and so unnecessarily~~ Rashi  
quotes Onkelos <sup>unnecessarily</sup> since everything is explained in Rabbinic  
literature, unless Rashi's motive was purely to explain  
Onkelos as his language is obscure. See Nahmanides who  
argues with Rashi; Rabbi E. Mizrahi; N. Adler, Netinah-  
Lager; S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos; Halachic Section,  
Group F. footnote 1.
10. cf. Siphra, ch.11, 7; Midrash Hagadol, LEV. p. 582.
11. Bab.Tal.Bech. 44<sup>b</sup>:- רבי ישמעאל אומר כל שנמרחו (כתותין) אשכין; -  
רבי עקיבא אומר כל שרוח באשכין.  
This is another case of discrepancy between the Targum  
and Rabbi Akiva, Onkelos' own reputed teacher. cf. Siphra  
(Pardess Jerusalem 1957) Piska 53; Maimonides:- הלכות ביאר  
מקדש פ"ז. ח. -  
Halachic Section, Group F, note 2.

GROUP D

12. cf. Siphra, 12, 1; Bab. Men. 68<sup>b</sup>; Midrash Hagadol, LEV. p. 541 ff; Lekah-Tov, v.2. p. 64 ff.
13. See also DEUT. 1<sup>17</sup> where Rashi quotes Onkelos: - "כקטן כגדול תשמעון, כתרומתו מלי וקרא כרבא דקבילון -  
But here also the same interpretation occurs in Siphra Piska 17; Midrash Tannaim, p.9; Lekah-Tov; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. p.28; Rashi LEV. 19<sup>15</sup>; Siphra, ch.4, Piska 37, 38, Midrash Hagadol, LEV. p.547 ff; Maimonides -  
אומר "זו מווג שכר זה ח". See also Midrashic Section, Group D, note 4.
14. Siphre Piska 86 - מ"ן ושכר יור - והרי י"ן הוא שכר ושכר הוא י"ן  
אלא שרברה ידורה שתי לשונות. רבי אלעזר הקב"ר  
אומר י"ן זה מווג שכר זה ח".  
cf. Ps. Jonathan, Palest. Targum and Neofiti:-  
"מן חמר חרר וקריק."
15. Sanh. 76<sup>b</sup>:- אמר שמואל מפני מה לא נאמרה יד בברזל שהברזל  
ממית בכל שהוא. תנא נמי הכי רבי אומר גלו ודוץ לפי מ'  
שומר והיה הקולד שהברזל ממית בכל שהוא לפיכך  
לא נרדנה ידורה בו עיקור.  
cf. Siphre Piska 10.

GROUP D

16. See N. Adler, who believes that Onkelos holds like "Tanna Kamma". cf. Bab. Git. 54<sup>a</sup>; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT.p.524; Halachic Section, Group C, note 2. Perhaps, however, Rashi's motive is to make us aware that Onkelos is in line with one tannaitic opinion, thus giving further support to this view.

17. (ed. Malbim) Piska 157:- השערה - מצוה בבית דין שיהא  
בגובהה של עיר ושיהיה בוקנט.

cf. Bab.Yeb.101<sup>a</sup>; Midrash Tannaim, p.166; Palest. Yeb. ch.12, Halacha 1; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. p.564.

NOTESHALACHA - GROUP E

1. Mechilta Parasha I. Bab.Tal.Baba Mets. 71<sup>a</sup>.
2. Onkelos:- ארי תובן עבדא בר ישראל
3. i.e. Rabbi Judah the Prince (b.135 C.E) the author of the Mishna.
4. In Bab.Ket.47<sup>b</sup> this argument is between the Rabbis and Rabbi Elazar.
5. cf. Ps. Jonathan and Palest. Targum.
6. Mechilta Parasha 8 - ענוש יענש - ממון אתה אומר או אינו אלא מיתה - הרי... מה להלן ממון אף כאן ממון.  
 And then - דייננ, שנאמר ואובנו פלילים - means - ונתן בכלילים -  
 - — פלילים (DEUT.32<sup>31</sup>) cf. Bab.Tal.Sanh.111<sup>b</sup>;  
 Siphre Parasha Hāzinu, on ch.32<sup>31</sup>, Piska 323. Midrash Tannaim, p.199; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. p.723. See Nahmanides, Ibn Ezra, Rashbam.
7. Onkelos:- וארי ינצון גברין וימחין... ולא יהא מותא אתגבאר - ירגבי ויתן על ממר דינא.  
 In other words money should be exacted from the offender and the amount is paid according to the estimation of the Judges. cf. Ps. Jonathan; Neofiti reads:- וארוב  
 ינצון גברין... מתקנסא יתקנס... ויתן על כוס דינן -

GROUP E

8. Bab.Tal. Baba Kamma 33<sup>b</sup>; *ibid*, ch.3 Mishna 9.
9. See Adler, Netinah-Lager.
10. The Pentateuch with Rashi's commentary. N.E.B. does not translate literally.
11. Bab. Tal. Baba Kamma 106<sup>a</sup>; Shebuoth 45<sup>a</sup>:- מכאן אמרו - Mechilta Parasha 16. כל הנשבעין, נשבעין ולא משלמין -
12. Onkelos - ויקבל מינה מומתא ולא ישלם - cf. the Syriac version - Hamikra Ve- Targumav by A. Geiger, p.123; Ps. Jonathan also follows the tradition - מומתא דה' - כהן' בין שניהן -
13. Mechilta Parasha 16 - רבי יוחנן בר יאשיה אומר אם - טרף יטרף יבארו עך - יביא עדים שנטרפה ויהא פטור מלשלם.  
cf. Bab. Baba Kamma 10<sup>b</sup> - (the argument between the Rabbis and Abba Shaoul); Nahmanides; Sforino; Midrash Hagadol, EX. p.515. See Halachic Section Group G. note 12.
14. cf. A. Sperber, The Bible in Aramaic.

GROUP E

15. Mechilta Parasha 19. cf. Bab.Tal.Temurah 4<sup>a</sup>; Nahmanides.
  
16. "בכורך ודמך לא תאחר". Ps. Jonathan interprets in both cases in accordance with tradition. Neofiti, however, reads:-  
 - מעשרת יבין ודמך לא תאחר -
  
17. Nahmanides, on the other hand, does quote him. See Section Rashi as Philologist, ch.5 - Injection of Derash and Halacha in Onkelos' Targum, note 5.
  
18. Mechilta Parasha 20; Bab.Tal.Sanh.27<sup>a</sup>; Baba Kamma 72<sup>b</sup>; Maimonides - הלכות ערוה פ"א.ג. -
  
19. Onkelos:- לא תשו ידך עם חייבא למהו ליה סהיד דעקר  
 "set not your hand with the wicked to be to him a false witness". cf. Ps. Jonathan who interprets similarly.
  
20. Bab.Tal.Sanh. 33<sup>b</sup>; Mechilta Parasha 20:- "הרי שויצא מבית דין מ"ב ומצאו לו זכות וכו'.. ת"ל ונקי; הרי שויצא מבית דין זכאי ואח"כ מצאו לו חובה וכו'.. ת"ל וצדיק אל תהרג."  
 cf. Midrash Hagadol, הלכות סנהדרין פ"ב.א. - Maimonides  
 EX. p.536.

GROUP E

21. Onkelos - (see A. - ודנזי ולי נפק (וכי) מן דינא לא תקטול - Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. p.53 on the word - (וכי). Onkelos is very concise and his interpretation is a short version of Ps. Jonathan who takes the same view as that of the Rabbis:-  
 - ולי נפק זכאי מבי דיך ואשכחו ליה  
 חוברתיה, ולי נפק ח"ב ואשכחו ליה וכו לא תקטול -  
 Onkelos usually modifies the Palestinian Targumim and consequently his Targum should be studied in the light of the Palestinian tradition. See Introduction to the Midrashic Section. Also *ibid*, Group A, note 1 (on GEN.4<sup>7</sup>).
22. Mechilta Parasha 20. cf. Pes. ch.5 Mishna 4; Palest. Tal. ch.5, Halacha 4; Ps. Jonathan translates in accordance with tradition:-  
 - עמי בנ ישראל לא תכסון  
 עי דחמיץ בבתיכון דס נכסר פסח  
 Neofiti, however, reads:-  
 - לא תכסון על חמיץ ארס נכסר  
 קדש' -
23. By translating - זבחי - by - פסח' - Onkelos learns like Rabbi Ishmael that the Paschal lamb is meant here and not - קרבן התמיד - the "daily sacrifice" as Rabbi Judah holds. See Section Rashi as Philologist, ch.5, note 6.
24. Parasha 20 (Weiss ed.) cf. Siphra LEV.6<sup>2</sup> - הא מה אט מקי"ע לא -  
 ילין מלב חגי עי בקר, זה האמור ללמד שיהא מעילן מן הארץ למזבח כל הילול  
 cf. Bab. Tal. Men.20<sup>b</sup>; Rashi on Ber.2<sup>a</sup> - דה מצור -  
 Meg.20<sup>b</sup>; Zeb.87<sup>b</sup>; Ps. Jonathan.

GROUP E

25. Whilst here Rashi does not quote Onkelos on EX.34<sup>25</sup>  
 - Rashi says - "כִּדְרֵגוֹמֹ" - "Render it like the  
 Targum - וְלֹא יִבְרָכֶן בְּרַם מִדְּבַח - See Halachic  
 Section, Group D, note 4.
26. Bab.Tal. Zeb.112<sup>b</sup> - "עֵי שֶׁלֹּא הִוָּקֵם הַמִּשְׁכָּן הָיוּ הַבְּמוֹרֵי" -  
 מוֹתֵרוֹת וְעִבּוֹדָה בְּבִכּוֹרֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל.  
 cf. Bab.Tal.Bech. 4<sup>b</sup>; Mechilta, Rabbi S. Ben Yohai, p.220;  
 Midrash Hagadol, EX. p. 553.
27. Onkelos - וְשִׁלַּח יָד בְּבִכּוֹרֵי בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל - "And he sent the  
 first-born of the children of Israel". cf. Ps. Jonathan,  
 Neofiti, however, translates literally: - וְשִׁלַּח יָד עוֹלְמִיָּהוּן  
 לְבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל.
28. However, Rashi, who agrees here with Onkelos, seems to  
 ignore his own interpretation in Zeb. 115<sup>b</sup> - (לֹה לִישָׁנָא אֲמִרְנָא)  
 that the - נֶגְרִי - lads brought only the animals, but the  
 actual sacrifices were made by the Cohanim and not by the  
 first-born. See Rabbi I. Berlin, Mine-Targuma, p.10. It  
 appears that Onkelos and Rashi take the view of R.J.Ben  
 Korḥa, who holds that - וְגַם הַכֹּהֲנִים הִנְגְּשִׁים - (EX.19<sup>22</sup>)  
 is referring to the first-born sons. cf. Zeb.115<sup>b</sup> and Rashi  
 EX.19<sup>22</sup>.



GROUP E

29. This is the translation of "The Soncino Chumash".  
(ed. A. Cohen 1974). cf. The Pentateuch. (ed. J.H. Hertz  
London 1961). N.E.B. reads:- "The man shall get himself  
shaved except for the scurfy part etc".
30. cf. Siphra (Pardess 1957 - Malbim) 153:-  
- בגדיו יהיו פרוקים -  
- קרוצים. וראשו יהיה פרוץ - לגדל שער דברי רבי אליעזר  
רבי עקיבא אומר... אף הויה בראש דבר שמוץ מגופו.  
cf. Bab.Tal. Moed-Katan 15<sup>a</sup>.
31. The famous commentator on the Talmud, "Ritba" (Moed  
Katan 24<sup>a</sup>) deduces from Onkelos that the "wrapping" of a  
mourner is a biblical law. (מן הכורה). Onkelos here  
follows the tradition, but on - ראשו יהיה פרוץ -  
he reproduces literally - ורישיה יהי פרוץ - perhaps  
in order to leave the way open for the view of Rabbi  
Akiva who holds that - פרוץ - signifies uncovering of the  
head. cf. NUM.5<sup>18</sup> - ופרץ את ראש האשה -  
where the Siphre, 56 states in the name of Rabbi Ishmael  
that it means to uncover her head. cf. Bab.Tal.Ket.72<sup>a</sup>;  
Rashi EX.32<sup>25</sup>. However, Ps. Jonathan represents the  
view of Rabbi Eliezer that he should let his hair grow  
wild:-  
- Neofiti, however, reads:-  
ומצרעה דמכתשה ביה לבושו יהון בויעין היך דמבוזעין על אבילה  
וראשיה יהון מכסי, ועלי עבמה יהון קוטמי.

GROUP E

32. Rashi - הַמוֹכֵן לִכְךָ מִיּוֹם אֶתְמוּל
33. Yoma 66<sup>a</sup>; Siphra Piska 57: - עִיט - שִׁי'ה מוֹמֵן, עִיט אֶף בְּטֵבֶת -  
עִיט אֶף בְּטֵמֵאֵרֶד .  
cf. Palest. Tal. Yoma, ch.6 Halacha 3; Ibn Ezra; Rashbam.
34. Onkelos - וַיִּשְׁלַח בִּיד גִּבֹּר דּוֹמִין לְמַדְבָּרָא  
Onkelos should <sup>Perhaps</sup> be understood in the light of Ps. Jonathan:-  
"A man who was ready from the previous day" - גִּבּוֹר דּוֹמִין מִן אֶשְׁתֵּינָקָד .  
Neofiti, however, reads: - וַיִּשְׁלַח בִּיד גִּבֹּר מוֹמֵן לְמַדְבָּרָא
35. Onkelos - וַאֲתֵתָה עָם אַחַתְהָ לֹא תִסֵּב לְאַעְקָא לְגִלְמָה עִיטָה -  
עֹלָה בַחֲדָא .
36. Rashi - אֵין לִי אֵלָא חֲרַע מִטֵּן לִרְבוּת כָּל אֲדָמָה תִּלָּא  
בְּעַמְךָ לֹא תִאֹרֶר .
37. The word - בְּעַמְךָ - is redundant and it would have sufficed to say - וְנִשְׁמָא לֹא תִאֹרֶר - The meaning, therefore, is to include any human being. cf. Rabbenu Nissim on Sanh. 66<sup>a</sup> who explains that - חֲרַע - and - נִשְׁמָא - are merely given as examples because they represent men at the two extremities of the social scale, but as a matter of fact cursing any human being is forbidden.

GROUP E

38. cf. Bab.Tal.Sanh. 66<sup>a</sup>; Sheb. 36<sup>a</sup>; Maimonides:-  
הלכות סנהדרין פכ"א.
39. cf. Ps. Jonathan:- לא תלוטון דלא שמע  
Neofiti reads:- לא תלוטון ית מה דלא שמע
40. Rashi:- והפדה לא נפדתה - פדויה ואינה פדויה וסתם כדיון  
בכסף. או חופשה - בשטר.
41. Siphra 53:- והפדה לא נפדתה - בכסף ובשוה כסף. בשטר מנן  
- ת"ל או חופשה לא נתן לה, להלן הוא אומר וכתב לה  
מה לה האמור להלן בשטר אף כאן בשטר.  
הלכות איסורי ביאה פ"ג. יג.- Maimonides:-  
cf. Bab. Keri. 11<sup>a</sup>;
42. In Palest. Tal.Kid. ch. 1 Halacha 1, Onkelos is quoted.  
See Halachic Section, Group F, note 6.
43. cf. Siphra (Pardess ed. Israel 1957) - יכול אפילו שרט על  
ביתו שנפל... ת"ל לנפש לא אמרתי שריטה מלא  
שהוא על המרה.  
וכתבת קעקע - הא כצד עד  
שיכתוב זקעקע בדיו.  
cf. Bab.Tal. Macc. 20<sup>a</sup>:-
44. cf. Ps. Jonathan; Ibn Ezra quotes Onkelos.

GROUP E

45. Siphra Parasha 8, Piska 11, Bab.Tal.Hul. 78<sup>b</sup>. See Section Rashi as Philologist, ch. 5, note 8.
46. Rashi follows the Sages and not Rabbi Hananiah who holds that -  
 אותו ואם בנו טהג בין בזכרים בין  
 בנקבות.
47. "ותורתא או שיתא ליה ולגרה לא תכסין בוקא חד" - Although the text has - אורנו - the masculine, nevertheless, Onkelos follows the Rabbis that the mother is meant and not the father. cf. Ps. Jonathan:-  
 יתה וית בררה  
 - צמי בני ישראל תורתא או  
 רחילא לא תכסין נכסת אוריה לשמה דה' לרצוה עליכון  
 תכסין יתה.
48. 79<sup>a</sup> s.v - עייל
49. Maimonides:- הלכות עמינות פ"ב, יא. - writes that this matter is in doubt, whether the Halacha is like Hanania or the Rabbis (see Kesef Mishne ).
50. Siphra; Parasha 10, Piska 5; Men. 66<sup>a</sup>.
51. See Bab.Men.65<sup>a</sup> with regard to the interpretation of the Sadducees that - מאחרת העובת - means on a Sunday.

GROUP E

## 51. (cont'd)

See Nahmanides; Mizrahi; Adler, Netinah-Lager. This subject is treated fully in Hoffman, LEV.II pp. 159-215, where the literature bearing upon this question is given. See also A. Geiger Hamikra Ve-Targumav, pp. 110-127.

52. cf. Ps. Jonathan. Neofiti also reads: - וינף ית צומרא קדם ה' לרצוה עליכון מן בחר יומא טובא קדמיה דפ'סמא

53. Bab. Tal. Succ. 35<sup>a</sup>; Siphra, ch.16,3. Ps. Jonathan; Palest. Targum. cf. also Neofiti: - ובסבון לכון בימה טובה - קדמיה פרי מילן מטבח תרוגין ולולבין והדס וערבה דנחלה וכו'..

54. See Hoffman, LEV. v.2. p. 198 ff.

55. Nahmanides, however, quotes Onkelos.

56. - ולא יבאו לראות כבלע את הקדש - אמר רב יהודה אמר רב בעצת הכנסת פליט לנרתיק שלהם

57. Onkelos translates: - ולא יעלין למקו ית מע קודשא ולא ימותון - Nahmanides states after quoting Rashi's interpretation - והיא דערבו של מונקלוס -

GROUP E

58. cf. Mishna Sot. 2,2; Siphre Piska 52: - אין מיד קדושים -  
אלא שקדשו במי כור.
59. Onkelos - ויסב כהנא מי כור במן דחסף -  
cf. Ps. Jonathan - ויסב כהנא מיין קדשין מן כור -
60. cf. Mishna Nazir 6,2; Maimonides: הלכות נזירות פ"ה ג.
61. The Bab. Nazir 39<sup>a</sup> makes it clear that Onkelos is in  
line with Rabbi Josi: - אמר רב יוסף כמאן מתרגמין  
מפורצין וצר יצורין כרבי יוסי -  
See Introduction to Halachic Section, footnote 4.
62. cf. Siphre Piska 101 - in the name of Rabbi Josiah;  
Rabbi Jonathan, however, holds the opposite that - בתי -  
is unintentionally (שוגג) and - פתאום - is un-  
avoidably (אונס). The same argument occurs in  
Bab.Tal. Keri. 9<sup>a</sup>. However, Rashi contradicts himself,  
for in Pes. 80<sup>b</sup> (ד"ה וכי ימור) interprets like Rabbi  
Jonathan that - פתאום - is inadvertently and - בתי -  
is unavoidably. Isaiah Berlin in his book - מיט  
תרומה - suggests that Rashi here does not state his  
own view or that of the Talmud, but only that of  
Onkelos who takes it as Rabbi Josiah.

GROUP E

63. Onkelos - וארי ימות מתא עלוהי בת כ"ף עגלון  
 Ps. Jonathan follows Onkelos:- וארום ימות מיתא עלו  
 (Onkelos renders - שגגה - על - עליו - ע. ג. ע. - עליו - על - שגגה - Onkelos renders - 42.)
64. The Mishna Nazir 6, 8 states:- היה נוטל שער ראש נזרו ומטלח תחת הדוד -  
 cf. Maimonides - הלכות נזיר - וד"ב פ"ה ב. -  
 Hagadol, NUM. p.87.
65. Onkelos' translation:- ויגלח נזירא וכו'... ויסב ית שער... ויתן  
 על מערבא די תחת דודא.  
 By adding the word - דודא - Onkelos incorporated the  
 traditional view. cf. Ps. Jonathan. Neofiti, however,  
 reads:- ויתן על מערבא די תמות בנסת קוש'ה
66. cf. Siphre, Piska 21; Bab.Tal.Zeb. 42<sup>b</sup>; Men. 73<sup>a</sup>.
67. Onkelos adds:- די יהי לך מקדש קודשא מותר מן אשתא כל קרבטון -  
 i.e. what is left from the fire after the fat has  
 been sacrificed. cf. Ps. Jonathan:- דין יהי לך מקדש  
 קודשא מה דמשתיר מעלתא דענא מן אישר-הא וכו'..
68. cf. Siphre Piska 50; all the Rabbis agree that  
 Scripture is speaking of an "earthen vessel". cf.  
 Maimonides - הלכות שומאית מת כ"א א. -

GROUP E

69. Onkelos - וכל מן דחסף פתח דלית מגופת שיץ מקף עליהי -  
cf. the Palest. Targum and Ps. Jonathan
70. Onkelos translates - מגופת שיץ - by - צמיר פתיל - .It  
appears he holds that the lid itself must be from -  
(cf. GEN. 11<sup>3</sup> where Onkelos takes - חומר - as - שיץ -  
mortar) - mortar and not metal. See, S.B. Schefftel,  
Biure Onkelos, pp. 198-199.
71. Other references where Onkelos translates in accordance  
with tradition are: NUM. 25<sup>4</sup> s. v - והוקף - Sanh. 35<sup>a</sup>.  
Again NUM. 35<sup>19</sup> - with regard to - גומל הדם - is in line  
with Bab. Macc. 12<sup>a</sup>.
72. cf. Siphre, Piska 8; Men. 34<sup>b</sup>; 2eb. 37<sup>b</sup>; Sanh. 4<sup>b</sup>;  
Rashi EX. 13<sup>16</sup>.
73. Onkelos - ונתק טריטון לאת על יד ירמון יתפילין בין עיניך -  
It is, however, difficult to understand Onkelos' reason  
for translating - לאות על ידך - literally and not  
like the traditional view that it means the "Tephillin  
Shelyad". In 13<sup>9</sup> Onkelos translates the whole verse  
literally, but Ps. Jonathan follows the tradition of  
the Rabbis. See Halachic Section, Group B, note 2.



GROUP E

74. cf. Siphre Piska 18.
75. Onkelos:- פלוגרסא דינא בקרויך -  
 It is significant that Onkelos does not translate  
 - by - נצרה - (his usual equivalent) but by  
 - ריבוי - פלוגרסא. This shows that it is a matter for the  
 court. Nahmanides after quoting Rashi's interpretation  
 says:- Ps. Jonathan וון היא דער אונקלוס  
 - מלי פלוגרסא - by - דברי ריבוי בשעריך - translates -  
 - Onkelos should therefore be understood  
 in the same way. Neofiti reads:- בקורייכון - מלי דיונין
76. cf. Siphre Piska 52-53. - יטול יהיו כל המשמרות שוים בקרבנות הוגל  
 הבאים שלא מומסת הוגל תל לבד ממכריו על האבות מה מכחו האבות זה לזה  
 את בשבתי ואתה בשבתך.  
 cf. Bab.Tal. Succ. 56<sup>a</sup>; Maimonides:- הלוט כל מקדע פל. ד.ה.  
 Bab. Baba Kamma 109<sup>b</sup>.
77. Onkelos:- חלק נחלק יכלון בר ממטרותא די"ת בשבתא בבן אפקיט אבהתא -  
 From his additions to the biblical text one can see  
 how faithful he is to the traditional interpretation.  
 Ps. Jonathan translates almost literally and takes  
 - as Elazar and Itamar. See Adler, Netinah-  
 Lager.

GROUP E

78. cf. Siphre Piska 140 - נחל איתן - במשמעו קשרה -  
cf. Rashbam in Bab. Bathra 55<sup>a</sup>, who interprets similarly.
79. Onkelos explains - לנחל איתן - "desolate valley".  
cf. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti; cf. GEN. 47<sup>19</sup> where Onkelos  
translates - לא ידבור - והאדמה לא תשג - by -  
(desolate, dry ground becomes hard: hence Rashi's קשה-קצה).
80. However, Maimonides - הלכות רוצח פ"ט. ג. - does not  
follow Onkelos and takes - נחל איתן - to mean a  
"fast flowing river" - נחל שותף בחוקה, וזהו -  
איתן האמור בתורה -  
cf. the translation of our text by N.E.B.
81. Mishna Sot. 46<sup>a</sup>; Siphre Piska 147; Maimonides -  
הלכות רוצח פ"ט. ג.
82. See Rabbi J. Caro, Kesef Mishne (commentary on Maimonides)  
who quotes Onkelos as Maimonides' source. cf. Ps.  
Jonathan. Also Neofiti - כהנא "מרון כפר לעמך ישראל -  
- וצאתה את צפרנה - תגדלם בני שתתנול
83. Rashi -

GROUP E

84. cf. Bab. Yeb. 48<sup>a</sup>; Maimonides:-. ה. ה. הלכות מלכים פ"ח. ה. -  
Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. p. 468.
85. cf. Sanh. ch.8, Mishna 2; Siphre Piska 34:-  
-הלכות ממרים פ"ז. א. ב. - Maimonides - וולל בבשר וסבא בין -  
-ו"מרון לסבי קריתיה בענא... ליתוהי מקבל מאינא - Onkelos  
ולל בקר וסבי חמרא -  
"And they shall say unto the Elders of his city....  
he does not listen to our word, eats flesh and drinks  
wine". Ps. Jonathan - חמרא ושתאי בחמרא -  
-לית הוא שמע בקולן אכל בבשרה ושתאי בחמרא - Neofiti
87. cf. Siphre Piska 82:-  
- יכול לא ילבט חלוק של צמר על גבי חלוק -  
של פשתן וחלוק של פשתן על גבי חלוק של צמר ידל ימדיו, אבל  
זה בפט עצמו וזה בפט עצמו מורכר.  
-הלכות בלאית פ"ז. כד. - Maimonides - כל איש פטו. י. - Mishna  
"בגד צמר שמברו עם בגד של פשתן בתכפה אחת אינו חיבור  
ואין זה בלאית".  
See Adler, Netinah-Lager; S.B. Schefftel - Biure  
Onkelos.
88. The Talmud deduces by means of analogy that  
- (cf. DEUT. 21<sup>18</sup>) - is with "lashes". - ויסרו מורנו -  
- cf. Siphre אמר רבי אבהו למדנו יסרו מוסר -  
- ויסרו מורנו - במכור - Piska 93.

GROUP E

89. cf. Ps. Jonathan. Neofiti, however, translates  
literally:- וַיִּסְבּוּן מִנֵּמִי קִרְיָא הוּא גְבֵרָא וַיִּרְדּוּן יִתְרָד  
*See Group A note 12*
90. See Maimonides - הלכות סנהדרין פט"ו. ב. and Kesef  
Mishne:- "ופירוש שער שעבד בו - היינו שער העיר שעבד  
ברה.
91. cf. Maimonides הלכות איסורי ביאה פ"ג. טז. and Maggid Mishne.
92. Ps. Jonathan, however, in both places translates - ליתרץ -  
which is contrary to the accepted Halacha.  
See Halachic Section, Group A. note 12.
93. cf. Cassuto, DEUT. p. 80:- מחר כלב - כנראה כנו של בון  
לשכר שמקבל אף הקדש על מעשי הזמה שלו.  
See, S. Luzzatto, his commentary on the Torah, p. 545.
94. Mishna. Tem. 29<sup>a</sup> - אִיזְהוּ אֵתֶם - הַאִמֵּר לֹאנָה הִלֵּךְ טָלָה זֶה בִּשְׂכַרְךָ  
and in the Mishna 30<sup>a</sup> וְאִיזְהוּ מִמֵּר כָּלֵב - הַאִמֵּר לַחֲבִירוֹ הִלֵּךְ טָלָה זֶה תַּחַת כָּלֵב  
cf. Maimonides הלכות איסורי מזבח פ"ד. טז.
95. Onkelos - לא תעיל אגיר ונתבא וחולפן כלבא לבית  
מקדשא.

GROUP E

## 95 (cont'd)

The prostitution hire of a whore or the exchange of a dog shall not be brought into the Temple. cf. Ps.

Jonathan and Palest. Targum. cf. also Neofiti - לא

תיעולן אגר דונן ופרוק כלב לבית מקדש

Note that מחר - is not rendered literally (= sale).

96. In p. 87<sup>b</sup>, the Talmud quotes a Beraita whereby the Rabbis have learnt by means of analogy (from - לא - that Scripture is referring to a labourer. (This is to exclude the opinion of Isi Ben Judah who holds that Scripture is referring to everyone who comes to the vineyard - בביתא כל אדם הכתוב מדבר - cf. Siphre Piska 132-133; Maimonides - הלכות עבירות פ"ב. א. - מפי השמועה למדו שאין הכתוב מדבר אלא בשכיר.

97. Onkelos in both verses 25 and 26 interprets the words - "when you are hired". cf. - by - ארי תתגר - כי תבא - Ps. Jonathan - ארי תיעול למיסב אגר - כבועל - Neofiti in both verses, reads - ארי תיעול כארס בכרמיה -

98. Beraita - ולא ימשכנו בדברים שעושין בהם אוכל נפש -  
See Mishna Baba Metsia. 115<sup>a</sup> - ולא רח"ה ורכב בלבד אמרו -  
אלא כל דבר שעושין בו אוכל נפש.  
cf. Maimonides - הלכות מלוה ולוה פ"ג. ב. -

GROUP E

99. Onkelos - לא יסב משכונא רחיא ורכבא ארי בהון מתעביר מזון לכל נפש -  
cf. Ps. Jonathan; Palest. Targum.  
Neofiti reads - ארום כל דעבד כרן בחובי נפשא הוא חביר -
100. Rashi - והדעמר בו - אינו חייב עד שישלם מע בו
101. Siphre Piska 139 - מגיד שאינו חייב עד שיכנסנו לרשותו.  
רבי יהודה אומר עד שיכנסנו לרשותו וישלם בו שנא' והדעמר בו ומכרו.  
cf. Mishna, Sanh. 11, 1.  
cf. Maimonides - הלכות גטבה פ"ט. ב. -
102. On the word - והדעמר - cf. Onkelos DEUT.23<sup>25</sup> and  
DEUT.21<sup>14</sup>. In GEN.37<sup>28</sup> Onkelos translates - סוחרים -  
by - דגרי -
103. cf. Ps. Jonathan - ויעבד ביה פרקמטיא וזביטניה -  
Neofiti reads - ויתגבבה וזבן ירה -
104. Rashi - אל השכר הזה הוא נושא את נפשו למות עלה בכבש -  
ונתלה באילן.
105. - נושא את נפשו - וכי למה עלה זה בכבש ומסר לך את נפשו -  
לא שתדון לו שכר בו בזם.

GROUP E

105. (cont'd).

cf. Bab. Baba Metsia 112<sup>a</sup>; Midrash Tannaim, (ed. D. Hoffmann), p. 159; Maimonides - הלכות טכירות פ"א. ב. - Rab. Saadia Gaon's commentary on the Torah, p.147 -  
 - cf. The Vulgate: "Ex eo sustentat animam suam". See, J. Komlosch, p. 205.

106. Rashi: - לא ימתו אבות - בערות בעם, וא"ת בעון בנים כבר נאמר איש בחטאו ימתו.

107. Siphre: - "וכי מה בא הכתוב ללמדנו שלא ימתו וכו'... והרי כבר נאמר וכו'... אלא בא ללמד שלא ימתו אבות בערותם של בנים."  
 cf. Bab. Sanh. 27<sup>b</sup>; Baba Kamma 88<sup>a</sup>.

108. cf. Ps. Jonathan; Targum Jonathan II Kings, 14<sup>6</sup>; Rabbi D. Kimhi; Zunz Haderashot Be-Israel, ch.5, p.35. and note 10 in p. 252. Neofiti, however, does not incorporate the Halacha - "לא ימותו אבן בחובי בן ובן לא ימותו בחובי אבן גבר בחובי נפשיה ימורדי."

109. Siphre Piska 13 - הקדש מן הבית - זה מעשר שני ונטע רבתי - הלכות מעשר שני פ"א. יב. - cf. Maas. Sheni, v.10; cf. Maimonides: Onkelos can not, here be referring to - מעשר ראשון - מעשר קטן -

GROUP E

110. cf. Ps. Jonathan.
111. Rashi - לא אכלתי באונ - מכאן שאסור - לאונן
112. For details see Maimonides - הלכות מעשר שני פ"ג.ו.
113. Siphre Piska 14 - לא אכלתי באונ - האמר אכלו באנטות אינו יכול להתקדות -  
cf. Maimonides - הלכות מעשר שני פ"ג.ה. - Bab.Pes.36<sup>a</sup>.  
Yeb. 73<sup>a</sup>.
114. cf. Ps. Jonathan - לא אכלתי ביומי אבדלי - cf. Palest.  
Targum and Neofiti.
115. See Bab. Yoma 26<sup>a</sup> - א' הכי עולה נמי דכתיב ונליל על קובחך -
116. cf. Ps. Jonathan and Palest. Targum.



NOTESHALACHA - GROUP F

1. See Section, Rashi as Philologist ch.1, note 18.  
In all fairness to Rashi in LEV.1.<sup>6</sup> he remarks that Onkelos' interpretation is in line with that of Abba Jose Ben Hanan who argues with the Rabbis:-

- בגצתה - עת בע מציה וכו'... וזהו שפירגה אונקלוס באוכליה, וזהו  
מכושעו של אבא יוסי בן חנן שאמר נוטל את הקרקבן עמה,  
ורבותינו ז"ל אמרו וכו'...

- בגצתה - means together with its entrails etc.  
This is what Onkelos means when he translates - באוכליה -  
This is also the interpretation given by Abba Jose Ben Hanan who states he removes the stomach (the organ which contains digested food) together with the crop. cf. Bab. Zeb. 65<sup>b</sup>; Siphra Parasha 7; Lekah-Tov; this Section, Group D, note 5. This is one of the few places in the Torah where Rashi points to Onkelos' support of a particular "tanna". cf. Rashi EX.25<sup>29</sup>. It is true, however, that in non-halachic aspects Rashi remarks that Onkelos' interpretation corresponds to one tannaitic opinion, e.g. DEUT.32<sup>26</sup>, see General Introduction, p. 34.

2. Mechilta Parasha 8, cf. Bab. Sanh. 79<sup>a</sup>; 87<sup>b</sup>; Hag. II<sup>a</sup>; Ket. 33<sup>b</sup>.

GROUP F

3. Rabbi Judah the Prince holds - המתכוין להרוג את זה והרג - מתכוין להרוג את זה - He who intends to kill a certain person and inadvertently kills another instead (as in the case here) is exempt from the death penalty and has only to pay his heirs - ממון - "money".
4. cf. Ps. Jonathan. Neofiti - ואם סקול תיהו'ו'יתן - reads - נפא תשלומי נפא - seems to follow Rabbi Judah the Prince. (Or perhaps - תשלומי - in the sense of - חלף).
5. Rashi - הרי'ו'ו'אזהרה לברכת השם ואזהרה לקלל דין - cf. Maimonides - הלכות סנהדרין פ"ו. א. - הלכות עבודה זרה פ"ב. ח. - who derives from this verse these two prohibitions.
6. See Bab. Tal. Sanh. 66<sup>a</sup>; cf. Mechilta, Parasha 19.
7. cf. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti.
8. This is another discrepancy between the Targum and Rabbi Akiva Onkelos' own reputed teacher. See Halachic Section, Group D, note 7.

GROUP F

9. The four garments are: (belt) - אֲבֵנֶת - (mitre) - מִצְנַפֶּרֶת -  
 - בִּתְנָד - and - מִכְנָסִים -  
 The Samaritan text reads - מִדֵּי - in plural.
10. For this reason itself Onkelos is not consistent  
 with Resh Lakish for otherwise there was no reason for  
 him to translate - מִדֵּי - in plural as in any case the  
 text mentions two garments, the shirt and the trousers.
11. The Bab. Keri. 13<sup>b</sup> explains the argument as follows: The  
 Rabbis through the rule of analogy - אֲנִי רֵא עֹרֶה -  
 (cf. NUM. 6<sup>3</sup> - שָׁכַר שָׁכַר מִנְיָן -) compare the "Cohen to  
 the Nazarite" and as the Nazarite should not drink wine  
 (- מִיין וְשֵׁכָר -) but he can have other drinks, so too  
 the Cohen (cf. Onkelos NUM. 6<sup>3</sup>). But Rabbi Judah holds  
 that we do not deduce the laws of the Cohen from those  
 of a Nazarite and - וְשֵׁכָר - (mentioned with regard to the  
 Cohen) is intended to include all drinks. cf. Maimonides:-  
 - הַלְבוּשׁ בִּיאָרֵךְ מִקִּדְשׁ פָּא. א.
12. cf. Keri. 13<sup>b</sup> - רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אָמַר אֵין לִי אֵלֶּא יֵין שֶׁאֵר מִשְׁכָּרִין מִטֵּן -  
 תָּל וְשֵׁכָר.
13. While in NUM. 6<sup>3</sup> Rashi quotes Onkelos, here he does not  
 quote him.

GROUP F

14. Here and in NUM.6<sup>3</sup> Ps. Jonathan and Palest. Targum follow Onkelos.
15. Onkelos:-      -ומליל ה' עם מעה בתר... בקרוביהון אשתא  
נוכרתא קרב ה'.
16. Siphra:-      -בקרבתא - רבי יוסי הגלילי אומר על הקר'בה  
מתו ולא על ההקרבה. רבי עקיבא אומר כתוב אחד אומר  
... הכריץ בהקר'בא אש ורה.. הו' על ההקרבה מתו ולא  
מתו על הקר'בה.
17. cf. Ps. Jonathan and Palest. Targum; Midrash Hagadol,  
LEV. p. 462.
18. cf. Siphra 53:-      -את שמצ'ה שפחה ומצ'ה בת חורין במאורסת  
לעבר עברי הכתוב מדבר דברי רבי עקיבא, רבי ישמעאל  
אומר בשפחה כנענית הכתוב מדבר המאורסת לעבר עברי.  
אחרי'ם אומרי'ם... בשפחה כנענית המאורסת לעבר כנעני.
19. In several cases Onkelos follows Rabbi Ishmael and not  
as A. Berliner holds that Onkelos translates according  
to Rabbi Akiva. On this subject, see J. Komlosh, pp.  
159-160. See also this Group, note 2, footnote 8; also  
Halachic Section, Group E, note 18.

GROUP F

20. In Bab. Kid.32<sup>b</sup> - the Talmud states that many Rabbis are of the opinion that only an old man who is also a - חכם - "wise" is referred to. Rabbi Jose holds that even if he is young, providing he acquired wisdom, he is entitled to such courtesy. Isi Ben Judah holds כל שיבה - that what is intended is any old man; cf. too, Siphra Piska 80.
21. cf. ibid.
22. While the French school (Rashi and Tosafoth in Kid.32<sup>b</sup>) failed to remark on Onkelos' interpretation, Nahmanides on this verse (as well as in - חידוש הרמב"ן - on Tractate Kid.32<sup>b</sup>) quotes him and tries to reconcile his view with that of the Talmud. Rabbenu Nissim ( הר"ן ) too, quotes him in his commentary on Alfasi: - "או שאונקלוס סובר כר"י דיעק וחכ"ם מכבדין או שהיה אונקלוס חולק על כל התנאים הללו וכו'.. See Introduction to Halacha, footnote 4.
23. Piska 19; cf. Bab.Sot.26<sup>a</sup>. Palest. Sot. ch.3,4.
24. ibid:- רבי עקיבא אומר שאם הייתה עקרה נפקדו - However, in Ber.31<sup>a</sup>, this is given as the opinion of Rabbi Ishmael and not of Rabbi Akiva.

GROUP F

25. cf. Onkelos GEN. 29<sup>32-35</sup> - וְיָרֵא - cf. Ps. Jonathan.

26. cf. Bab. Nazir 19<sup>a</sup> and 22<sup>a</sup>; Baba Kamma 91<sup>b</sup>; Ned. 10<sup>a</sup>; Taan. 11<sup>a</sup>; Sheb. 8<sup>a</sup>; Sot. 15<sup>a</sup>; Keri. 26<sup>a</sup>.

27. This is the version in many texts of the Targum Onkelos, including that of A. Sperber. cf. Ps. Jonathan. There are, however, some versions which read in Onkelos - וַיִּכְבֹּר עֲלוֹהֵי מְדָחָב עַל נִפְעָא - which is a literal translation. Rashi, however, had in Onkelos - וַיִּכְבֹּר עֲלוֹהֵי מְדָחָב עַל מִירְצָא - for in Taan. 11<sup>a</sup> (וְיֵה לְשִׁמְעוֹן) Rashi says - כִּתְרוֹמֶן, מֵאֲשֶׁר - חָטָא עַל הַנֶּפֶשׁ, פָּשַׁע הַמְּקָרָא עַל שְׁנֵי מֵמָה בְּמִידָה -

Understand it as the Targum that the Nazarite's sin was because he defiled himself by a corpse.

Texts of Onkelos may have been brought into line with the Talmud.

NOTESHALACHA - GROUP G

1. - והיא באמת משמעות הכתוב אבל לפי מדרש רבותינו אינו כן  
שהרי שנית להסגיר את הקומר בסוף שבוע ראשון ולפסוק את  
הקומר בסוף שבוע שניה וכו'.

See E. Mizrahi who admits that Rashi is against the  
Halacha.

2. הנסה - הכי עשה שום אלוה לבוא לקחת לו ... Rashi....

3. cf. Bab. Sheb. 35<sup>a</sup>; Ibn Ezra.

4. cf. Ps. Jonathan: - לאתגלאר  
או - Neofiti - או נס"א דעבר מעמרא דה' -  
Palest. Targum: - נס"ה דעבר דה' -

5. See Rashi EX.23<sup>2</sup>: - אחרי רבים - יש במקרא זה מדרש חכמי  
ישראל אבל אין לשון המקרא מיושב בהן על אופניו,  
מכאן דרשו וכו'.

See General Introduction, p. 17.

6. ibid EX.23<sup>2</sup>: - אחרי רבים - יש במקרא... ואנא אומר ל"עבו  
על אופניו כפשוטו כך פטרונו

7. For the sake of clarity we shall term his Halachic  
deduction as "Peshat Halacha" in contradiction to  
"Derash Halacha".

GROUP G

8. A technical term for that portion of the sacrifice which is not eaten within the prescribed period.
9. cf. Rashi EX.16<sup>29</sup>; EX.22<sup>8</sup>; EX.33<sup>2</sup>.
10. cf. Bab.Tal.Pes.99<sup>a</sup>; Mechilta, Parasha 3.
11. And sometimes without even saying - לֹכֵ' בַּשּׁוּמֵן - he is implying the "Peshat Halacha" of the text. cf. LEV. 6<sup>5</sup>; LEV. 8<sup>34</sup>; NUM. 5<sup>8</sup>. In other instances he makes it clear that their "Derash Halacha" fits well with the Peshat of the text. cf. EX. 21<sup>19</sup>; EX. 22<sup>29</sup>.
12. See Maimonides:- הלכות קרבן פסח פ"ח. י.
13. cf. Bab. Tal.Kid. 14<sup>b</sup>; Rashi LEV.25<sup>40</sup>.
14. See Maimonides:- הלכות עבדים פ"ג. יב.  
 "מה בין מוכר עצמו למכרוהו בית דין, מוכר עצמו אינו נרצח  
 ומכרוהו בית דין נרצח".
15. The Pentateuch with Rashi's commentary. N.E.B. does not translate literally.



GROUP G

16. See Bab. Baba Kamma 50<sup>a</sup> בר ברושות (לדעת רבה) נמי חייב דכתיב בעל הבור בבור דאית ליה בעליה; ורבי שמעון סבר בעל הבור - . . .
17. cf. Maimonides: - הלכות נזקי ממון פ"ב. ב. -
18. Bab. Baba Kamma 107<sup>b</sup>.
19. cf. Bab. Tal. Kid. 62<sup>a</sup>. See Nahmanides; Ibn Ezra.
20. cf. Bab. Tal. Sot. 19<sup>b</sup>.
21. cf. Bab. Tal. Pes. 93<sup>b</sup>; Palest. Tal. Pes. 9. Halacha 2.  
Rabbi Eliezer holds that the "journey" need not be a distant one, but even - כמאסקיפת העזרה - though he was merely outside the threshold of the forecourt of the Temple.
22. cf. Maimonides: - הלכות קרבן פסח פ"ה. ח. -
23. cf. Bab. Tal. Sanh. 45<sup>b</sup>. Rabbi Eliezer applies the hermeneutical principle of - מ"ע נ - and - רבוי -
24. cf. also DEUT. 23<sup>19</sup> - where Rashi (s.v. - שנהם -) follows the opinion of "Beth Shammai" and not that of "Beth Hillel". See Bab. Tem. 30<sup>b</sup>. Again DEUT. 23<sup>16</sup> where

GROUP G

## 24. (cont'd).

Rashi follows Onkelos' interpretation, although it is rejected in Bab. Git. 54<sup>a</sup> by Rabbi Ahi Ben Josiah. See Halachic Section, Group D, note 11 and General Introduction, p. 17.

25. cf. Rashi LEV.13<sup>55</sup> - where he says clearly that their "Derash Halacha" should not be detached from the setting of the text. In EX.12<sup>2</sup> - Rashi rejects the Derash Halacha, simply because - אין מקרא יוצא מיד' פשוטו - no Scriptural text can lose its literal meaning.

26. Parasha 16; cf. Mechilta Rabbi Simeon Ben Yohai; Bab. Baba Kamma 11<sup>a</sup>; Midrash Hagadol, EX. pp.514-515; Nahmanides; Ibn Ezra; Rabbi S. Ben-Meir; Halachic Section, Group E, note 6.

NOTESSUMMARY

1. Divrei-Shalom-Ve-Emeth. In note 7 after quoting EX.21<sup>24</sup>  
 "eye for an eye" - he writes the following - וְיָקוּם בְּתַרְגוּם -  
 אֲרָמִי שֶׁל אֲוִנְקֵלוֹס לֹא נוֹסֵפֶה מִלָּה בְּזֶה, וְכִבֵּר הָעִירוֹתִי בְּאִזְרֵי  
 מְקוֹמוֹת שֶׁרָק בְּדִבְרֵי הַמַּסּוֹר לְבִ"ד נִהְגוּ כֵן בְּתַרְגוּם אֲרָמִי  
 וְסָמְכוּ כִּי הַבִּ"ד יִדְעוּ לְשַׁפּוֹט כִּפִּי הַקְּבִלָּה.

In note 8 he writes again - וְאֵי כִּבֵּר הָרֵאִיתִי בְּבִירוֹר גָּדוֹל -  
 כִּי הָרֵשָׁה לְעֶצְמוֹ (אֲוִנְקֵלוֹס) זֶה הַשִּׁנּוּי וְהַדּוּמָה לוֹ רָק בְּמְקוֹמוֹת  
 שֶׁהִמְצִיחַ אֶל הָאֲזִיזָה נִוְגָעֵת לְכָל הָעֵד מִקֵּטָן וְעַד גָּדוֹל כִּמוֹ  
 בֶּשֶׁר וְחַלְבֵּי פֶן יֵאָמְרוּ כִּי לֹא אִסְרָה תּוֹרָה רָק הַבִּיטּוֹל וְרָק הַגְדִּי  
 בְּחַלְבֵּי אֲמֹנוֹת. אֲבָל בִּיחּוּד בְּמְקוֹמוֹת שֶׁהִדְבִּיר מַסּוֹר לְבִ"ד  
 תַּרְגוּם מִלָּה בְּמִלָּה וְסָמַךְ עַל חֲכָמֵי הַדּוֹר כִּי יִדְעוּ דִּבְרֵי  
 קְבִלָּה.

cf. A. Berliner - Targum Onkelos, p.224.

2. *ibid*, A. Berliner.

3. In his Introduction to his commentary on Targum Onkelos:-  
 - לִכְן נִרְאֶה לְפָעֻם שֶׁאֲוִנְקֵלוֹס שִׁנֶּה לְתַרְגוּם עַל פִּי הַקְּבִלָּה רָק  
 בְּהַמְקוֹמוֹת אֲשֶׁר הַמִּינִים צוּקִים וּבִיתוּסִים כִּמְשׁוֹ בֵּהֶם  
 וַיִּבְחָרוּ לָהֶם פִּירוּשִׁים הַעוֹלִים עַל רוּחָם.

SUMMARY

4. P. Churgin refuted also Adler's theory - see Horev IX 1946 - p. 83 - "Halacha be-Targum Onkelos":-

"דעתו (אדלר) היא שאונקלוס נענה בתרגומו לצורך הק"ם, הוא יצא מגדרו לפרש את הכתוב לפי ההלכה בכל ענין שהמ"ם צדוקים וביתוסים חלקו על הקבלה. דעה זה אינה מבוססת כל צרכה שהרי היא מחייבת אותנו להאמין במחלוקת של מ"ם וצדוקים. ברבריים שלא שמענו עליהם אף לא ברמז קלוש במקום אחר. לא שמענו שהיו חולקים מאיזה צד שהוא בישראל על ההלכה שרין רוצח בערים ובר"ם (אונקלוס קובץ ארז ההלכה הוא בתרגומו של שפור דם האדם וכו') או שאמה כנענית יוצאת בשטר (שטימן אונקלוס בתרגומו של והפדה לא נפדיתה שאצל שפחה חרופה). וכן אין טעם מובהק שבקש אונקלוס בתרגומו להכריע בין רצות החכמים ורבי'ם הם תרגומי הלכה וכו'...

See J. Komlosch, p. 158.

5. Mishna:- "האדוקים אומרים עד שיהרג שנאמר נפש תחת נפש אמרו להם חכמים והלא כבר נאמר ועשיתם לו כאשר ומע לעשות לאחיו והרי אחיו ק"ם.

- כאשר ומע- ולא כאשר עשרה - cf. Rashi - DEUT. 19<sup>19</sup>:-

See the story of Shimon Ben Shetah, his son and Susanna in the Apocrypha (Jerus Sanhed VI<sup>3</sup>) v.48 ff., with regard to the validity of the Halacha of - עדים וזמנים -

SUMMARY

6. Onkelos ליה כמא די חשיב למעבד לאמוריה ויפלי עב דביש -
7. Bab.Tal.Yoma 19<sup>b</sup> and 53<sup>a</sup>.cf. Siphra 7, 8. TosafTa Yoma, ch.1; Palest.Tal.ch.1,5. Maimonides הלכות עבודת ה' - יום הכפורים - פ"א ז.  
Midrash Hagadol, LEV. p. 480.
8. cf. Yoma 53<sup>a</sup>:- ת"ר ונתן את הקטרת על האש וכו'. שלא יתקן מבחוץ וכנס להוציא מלבן של צדוקים שאומרים יתקן מבחוץ וכנס, מאי דרוש כי בענן אראה על הכפורת וכו'..
9. Mishna Baba Bathra, ch.8,2, and Bab.Tal.122<sup>b</sup>;Ket.90<sup>a</sup>; Palest.Tal.Baba Bat.8,1; Meg. - Taanith, ch.5.
10. Mishna, ibid - כל יוצא ירכו של בן קודמין לברך
11. cf. Bab.Tal. Baba Bath, p.122<sup>b</sup> - ת"ר אין לי אלא בן בן ובן או - בית הבן או בן בית הבן מנין תל אין לו - עין עליו.
12. See A. Geiger, Hamikra-Ve-Targumav, pp.69-102 on the "halachic differences" between the Pharisees and the Sadducees. The reader will see that there are several "halachic texts" of which there are arguments between the Pharisees and the Sadducees, with regard to their interpretations and Onkelos did not interpret them

SUMMARY

12. (cont'd).  
in accordance with the Pharisees' view (see especially pp. 89-93).
13. His Introduction:-      "לֹא נִרְאֶה לְעֹנֵי וְכוּ'. . . אִם בְּדִינָם וְהִלְכוּת  
אֲשֶׁר הָעָם לֹא הָיוּ נוֹהֲרִים בָּהֶם מִמִּשְׁנֵי יְדִיעַת הַקְּבִלָּה אִם  
בְּמִקְוֹת אֲשֶׁר הִתְנַאֲפוּ הַקְּדוּמִים לִפְנֵי הַחֲזִיקוֹ בְּמַחְלֹקֶת הַוִּסוּף  
הוּא אִיוּ מִלֵּל בְּתַרְגוּמוֹ לְהַכְרִיץ כְּאַחֵר מֵהֶם."
14. Many more cases of this nature will be found in  
Halachic Section, Group E:
15. See further this ch. (suggestion 6).
16. See Halachic Section, Group A.II.
17. I say on the whole because we cannot say he avoided  
him completely since in a few instances he did quote  
him (see Groups C and D).
18. In several instances Onkelos' interpretations correspond  
with the Mishna, cf. NUM.5<sup>17</sup> - Mishna Sot.15<sup>b</sup>; NUM.6<sup>8</sup>  
- Mishna Nazir 45<sup>b</sup>; DEUT.21<sup>20</sup> - Mishna Sanh.70<sup>a</sup>; DEUT.21<sup>8</sup> -  
Mishna Sot.46<sup>a</sup>. Regarding the latter quotation see N.Adler,  
Netinah-Lager who says that Onkelos knew the Mishna. Many  
more examples can be found in Halachic Section, Group E.

SUMMARY

19. See Halachic Section, Group F, note 5.
20. See Halachic Section, Group E, note 18; Halachic Section, Group F, notes 2 and 6. In several instances Onkelos follows Rabbi Ishmael's view. See J. Komlosh, pp.159-160.
21. M. Liber, Rashi, p.92. cf. Midrashic Section, Group E(C).
22. See Halachic Section, Group G, General Introduction, p.17.
23. - תרגום של תורה אונקלוס הגר אמרו מפי רבי אליעזר ורבי יהושע .  
In Palest. Tal.Meg., however, a different version is  
given:- תרגום של תורה . . . . לפנ רבי אליעזר ורבי יהושע .
24. Halachic Section, Group E, notes 2 and 36.
25. cf. DEUT.17<sup>5</sup> :- המתרגם אל שערך לתרץ בית דין שועה  
See Halachic Section , Group C, note 7.
26. Rashi has used the same terms even in non "halachic expositions", e.g. GEN.15<sup>11</sup>; GEN.43<sup>2</sup>; EX.23<sup>27</sup>. Although Rashi on several occasions has refuted also the Midrash of the Rabbis, nevertheless he never expressed himself so forcibly. See Section - Rashi as Philologist, ch.7. Rejection of Onkelos' translation.

SUMMARY

27. Rabbi Eliezer was called - שמוראי - cf. Palest.Shebi. ch.9; Palest. Bets.ch.4<sup>7</sup>. cf. Maimonides' commentary on the Mishna Sheb.ch.9<sup>9</sup> - "רבי אליעזר דקטו כדעת בית שמאי" -  
 מעפ"י שהוא מהלמירי בית הלל. וכן נזכר מכל דבריו  
 בגמרא. וכן אמרו רבי אליעזר שמוראי הוא.  
 cf. Rabbi Shelomo Adani - Melecheth Shelomo Mishna Sheb. ch.9, who explains that Rabbi Eliezer belonged to the "School of Shammai".
28. At first there was opposition to the use of written Targumim. See Mishna Meg. 4.4, that the "Translator" had to translate orally, cf. B.J. Roberts - The Old Testament Text and Versions, p. 197 ff. We know, however, of earlier Targumim on the Hagiographia, cf. Bab.Shab.115<sup>a</sup> that Gamliel I authorised the destruction of a Targum to the Book of Job, possibly the one now known from the Dead Sea Scroll. See Michael Sokoloff, "The Targum to Job", Bar Ilan University, 1974, p. 4 ff.
29. A salary was even attached to this office. See Bab.Pes.50<sup>b</sup>.
30. For details see Mishna, Meg. 3,2.



SUMMARY

31. See General Introduction, p. 22.
32. The identification of Onkelos with Aquila, the author of the literal translation of the Old Testament into Greek, is a subject of discussion in many works of scholarship. cf. Silverstone Aquila and Onkelos, 1931. Also B.J. Roberts, op. cit. pp. 204 ff; cf. P. Kahle, The Cairo Geniza, p. 117.
33. See Introduction to Midrashic Section with regard to Midrashic and Halachic insertions as well as to Free Translation in Onkelos' Targum. See also Section Rashi as Philologist, ch. 3.
34. P. Kahle, op.cit. p. 119 (quoted also by B.J. Roberts, op. cit. p. 205) believes that the "halachic material which occurs from time to time in the Targum is the remains of what at one time characterized the work as a whole, but was expunged as a result of Aquila's work on the strict definition of the text". His argument is not convincing, for, if this is the case, one would not expect to find so great a remnant of "halachic" expositions in this Targum, and certainly not expositions which are contrary to the views of Rabbi Akiva himself (see Group F, notes 2 and 6 ) or for that matter Halachot which are not in

SUMMARY

34. (cont'd).

conformity with tradition (e.g. Group A). I, therefore, believe that Onkelos' Targum was, primarily a translation, strictly literal, and this is why it was accepted by Rabbi Akiva who was, somehow, dissatisfied with the LXX and other versions. Furthermore, being strictly literal, it enabled the unlearned to concentrate on the text without being confused by the Halachot which are of no consequence to him. It was only after Rabbi Akiva died that somehow, every time this Targum was revised, the various halachic expositions of the Meturgemanim were inserted in the Targum itself. See Introduction to Section Anthropomorphism, footnote 31.

35. A similar idea was expressed by P. Churgin (Horev IX 1946, pp. 79-83). On p. 83, he writes: - "אין ספק בדבר שבאשיתו היה התרגום כיון אמרי הפעם וביסודו - מסירת הדברים שבתורה כמות שהם להמון העם שלא יכלו להבין את התורה בלשונה. ואולם במשך הזמן נתברר שאי אפשר לתרגם מבלי ביאור ופירוש והארה עתה פסוק כצורתו יכול לפעמים לשמש את היצירות... והתמלול להכנס לתוך התרגום האות ב'אורי'".
36. cf. P. Churgin (ibid): - "עלינו איפא להסיק שלא היתה במירה מרעה בתרגומים ההלכיים באונקלוס. לא מצוונה ולא מטעם צומד ומחשבון תרגם אונקלוס מקראות אלה לפי ההלכה ומקראות אמרי' לפי הפעם. כל זה אירץ במקרה

SUMMARY

36. (cont'd). בדרכ גידולו והתהוותו של התרגום. הוא  
 התרגום לא יצא לעולם שלם וכו'.. חכמי התורה  
 וחכמי המקרא עיט העם של התורה הפכו והפכו  
 בתרגומיו והוסיפו וגרעו ועינו, שהרי הוא התרגום  
 נאמר לרבים לפיכך צריכה תעודתו להיות מנוונת  
 כלפי צרכיהם המיוחדים באותה שעה..

## NOTES

INTRODUCTION TO THE MIDRASHIC SECTION

1. A History of the Jewish People in the time of Jesus Christ, 1, 1 Edinburgh 1916, p. 154 - quoted also by G. Vermes, Haggada in Onkelos' Targum, Journal of Semitic Studies, v.8, Manchester University Press, pp. 159-69.
2. The Old Testament Text and Versions, 1951, pp. 206-207. Some writers add DEUT. 32-33. See also T. Walker in the Hastings Dictionary of the Bible, Art. "Targum" IV (Edinburgh, 1902), p. 680. W.O.E. Oesterley and G.H. Box, A Short Survey of the Literature of Rabbinical and Mediaeval Judaism. (London 1920), p. 51. A. Bentzen in his Introduction to the Old Testament, 3, ed. 1 (Copenhagen, 1957), p. 69 - quoted by G. Vermes, ibid. J.S.S., v.8, p.160.
3. Introduction to the Old Testament, New York 1948, p. 78. See G. Vermes, J.S.S. ibid, p. 160 - who quotes other scholars who share this opinion.
4. Targum Onkelos, II, Berlin 1884, pp. 224-45. L. Zunz's statement that only occasionally had Onkelos used the "Derash" is also incorrect when one takes into account the very large number of midrashic interpretations which exist in Onkelos' Targum: -  
 "היחס של תרגום ירושלמי לאונקלוס -  
 הוא כחומר של מדרש אל הפשט. אונקלוס הוא לפעמים דורש וכל ירושלמי הוא רק  
 לפעמים מדרש".  
 See Haderashot - Be-Israel, p. 38.

INTRODUCTION

5. J.S.S. v.8, op. cit. p. 161.

6. Scholars differ as to the origin of Onkelos' Targum.

A. Geiger, Hamikra-Ve-Targumav, p. 290, believes that Onkelos is of Babylonian origin. This is also the view of Paul Kahle, The Cairo Geniza, London 1947, p.117. I am, however, inclined to share the view of Leopold Zunz - Die Vorträge der Juden Historisch Entwickelt 1832, p. 62 - supported by G. Vermes, *ibid*, p.169, who both believe that Onkelos is a Babylonian revision of Palestinian Targumic tradition. On this subject see also B. J. Roberts, The Old Testament Text and Versions, op. cit. p. 205-206. It is true, however, that in several cases (see Group B) Onkelos takes an independent line from that of the Palestinian Targumim available to us. And consequently, the theory that Onkelos is a shortened version of Ps. Jonathan is open to question. See Midrashic Section, Group A, note 1. We may also say that Jonathan on the Prophets has seen Onkelos' Targum for Jonathan's interpretation on JUDGES, ch.5<sup>26</sup> is identical with that of Onkelos in DEUT.ch.22<sup>5</sup>. Similarly, Jonathan II KINGS, ch.14<sup>6</sup> is exactly like that of Onkelos, DEUT. ch.26<sup>16</sup>; Again Jonathan, JER. ch.48<sup>45-46</sup> - is similar to that of Onkelos, NUM.ch.21<sup>28-29</sup>. See L. Zunz, Haderashot Be-Israel, ch.5, pp.35-41 with special attention to note 10 on p. 252. This

6. (cont'd).

assertion is correct only if we accept the theory that the author of the Targum on the Prophets is Rab. Joseph and not Jonathan, Hillel's disciple. (See Bab.Tal.Meg.3<sup>a</sup>; Rashi and Jonathan's Targum on the Prophets). In support of this theory many interpretations of Jonathan's Targum are quoted in the Talmud in the name of Rab. Joseph. See JER. ch.46<sup>20</sup> - and quoted in Yoma, p.32<sup>b</sup>; AMOS, ch.6<sup>7</sup> - quoted Ned.p.38<sup>a</sup>; ZECH. ch.9<sup>6</sup> - quoted Kid.p.72<sup>b</sup>; ISAIAH, ch.5<sup>17</sup> - quoted Pes. p. 68<sup>a</sup>; ISAIAH, ch.19<sup>18</sup> - quoted Men.110<sup>a</sup>; EX.25<sup>5</sup> - quoted Shab.28<sup>a</sup>; NUM.6<sup>4</sup> - quoted Naz.39<sup>a</sup>. See the following note.

7. This would explain the assertion of the Babylonian Talmud, Kid.49<sup>a</sup>, in referring to Onkelos as - תרגומא דאורייתא - "Our Targum". Sometimes Onkelos is quoted in the Talmud just by - תרגומא דאורייתא - cf. Bab.Tal.Rosh Hashana, p.33<sup>b</sup>; Meg. p.10<sup>b</sup>; Git.p.68<sup>b</sup>; Sanh. p.106<sup>b</sup>; Hul.p.80<sup>a</sup>; Bech. p.50<sup>a</sup>. And sometimes it is Rab. JOseph who quotes Onkelos' Targum, e.g. Shab. p.28<sup>a</sup>; Shab.p. 64<sup>a</sup>.

8. See Halachic Section, Group E and Midrashic Section, Group C.

9. See J.W. Bowker, Haggadah in the Targum Onkelos. J.S.S. v.12, p.52 - who remarked that Rashi was fully aware of the midrashic elements found in Onkelos. (However some of his examples, such as GEN.ch.3<sup>24</sup>; GEN.ch.11<sup>6</sup> - are merely obscure textual words where Rashi turns to Onkelos for guidance).

NOTESMIDRASH - GROUP A

1. The word - נשט - can be read with the preceeding and the following clause. If it is taken with the first part of the verse then - נשט - is interpreted in the sense of - נשט - to bear with, hence to forgive.
2. Here - נשט - is read with the clause that follows it and consequently it is derived from - נשט - "measure" - the sin overflows the measure. cf. Bab.Tal.Yoma, p.52<sup>b</sup>; Bab.Tal.Kid.p.30<sup>b</sup>; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p.114.
3. See Maimonides, Guide to the Perplexed, v.3, ch.17; Maimonides: Mishne-Torah, Hilchot Teshubah, ch.5.
4. The same interpretation is given by the Palestinian Targum and Neofiti. We may, therefore, suggest that Onkelos is dependent on Palestinian Targumic tradition, and not vice versa. On the whole, Onkelos modifies and condenses the more diffuse and elaborate midrashic interpretations found in the Palestinian Targumic versions. Undoubtedly, these Targumim were current in his lifetime, and he therefore, incorporated them in his own Targum. If, however, his brevity and conciseness make his Targum obscure and unintelligible, then we must turn to the other Palestinian Targumim for guidance. However, in some cases (as can be seen from these chapters), Onkelos takes an independent line from

GROUP A

4. (cont'd).

that of the Targumim available to us. Although we cannot decipher his sources, yet we may safely assume that he had some other Palestinian Targumic tradition before him. On this subject see G. Vermes, J.S.S. v.8, op-cit. p. 169 who expresses the same view that Onkelos is dependent on Palestinian tradition, and not as some scholars such as G. Dalman-Grammatik der jüdischpalästineschen Aramaisch, second ed. (Leipzig 1905), p.31 and G.F. Moore, Judaism, I, 174 - who hold that it is the Palestinian Targumim who embroider and elaborate on the bare and literal translation of Onkelos. *See Supra p. 651 footnote 6. See further Group C note 24 footnote 72.*

5. Ps. Jonathan reads - וְיֵשְׁבוּן בַּמִּדְרָשׁ דְּשֵׁם

And they shall dwell in the "school" of Shem.

Onkelos is taking an independent line, see above footnote 4.

6. cf. Onkelos, GEN.24<sup>62</sup>; GEN.25<sup>11</sup>.

7. Ps. Jonathan translates - בֵּיַר דְּאִיתְגַּל עֲלֶיהָ חַי וְקַיִם

"The well at which the living God had appeared to her".

cf. GEN. Rabbah, ch.45, 10 in the name Rabbi Judah Ben Simon.



GROUP A

8. See Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p. 268, that it was  
- במקראה הנבואה - "a prophetic vision".
9. See Maimonides, Guide to the Perplexed, v.2, ch.42.
10. It appears that whilst Onkelos and Rashi take אל-הים -  
as - קדש - Ps. Jonathan takes it as - חול - for he  
translates:- והיה כד בעו לאמץאה יתי פלמי טעותא ונפקי  
מבית אבא...
11. The expression - ואונקלוס תרגם מה שתרגם - denotes  
a rejection of Onkelos' interpretation. See Section  
Anthropomorphisms, Group I, References Exposed to  
Polytheistic Interpretation, note 4. Also, ch.  
Reverence to God, note 5.
12. Ps. Jonathan, the Palest. Targum and Neofiti do not  
translate that Abimelech gave "a garment of honour" to  
Abraham.
13. cf. Onkelos, GEN.3<sup>21</sup> on the expression - כבודות קור -  
See Midrashic Section, Group C, note 2.
14. cf. GEN. Rabbah 52, 12:- כסות צינים - אמר רבי יוחנן עשה לה  
כסות עיהיו הכל מביטין בה ולא בנהו וכד...

14. (cont'd).

cf. Yalk. Shimoni 91 - נשל לבוש מלכות והלביטה ועטמה  
מטרונה, ולמה כרי שלא יתבץ אדם אותה.

See Midrash Hagadol GEN. op.cit.p.331; Rab. Saadia  
Gaon on the Torah, Rabbi David Kimhi, p. 116.

15. See S. Luzzatto, Oheb.Ger, p.36 who quotes another  
version in Onkelos. See, S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos,  
p.36; M. Levenstein, Nefesh Hager, op. cit. p. 69;  
N. Adler, Netinah-Lager.

16. See Nahmanides who interprets Onkelos differently. It is  
quite common for Onkelos to translate geographical place-  
names midrashically, e.g. GEN.4<sup>16</sup> - דֵּעַ - DEUT.  
ch.1<sup>1</sup>. See S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, op. cit.p.221.  
See Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch.5. Injection of  
Derash and Halacha in Onkelos' Targum, note 12 ff.

17. See GEN. Rabbah, ch.55, 7 - רבי חייא רבה ורבי ינאי מן אמר -  
למקום שבוראה יצאה לעולם ואמרנא אמר למקום שיראה  
יצאה לעולם וכו'.. רבנן אמרי למקום שהקטרת קריבין. המקום  
אלך לי אל הר. המור ואל גבעת הלבונה.

The first two interpretations occur also in the Bab.Tal.  
Taa. 16<sup>a</sup>; cf. the Palest. Tal.Ber.ch.4, Halacha 5;  
Tanhuma, Parashat Vayera, ch.22; Yalk.Shimoni, 247, 96;  
Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p.349.

18. In this case as well as in GEN.4<sup>7</sup> ( כְּתִיבִּיּוֹן פִּירוּשׁ ), or GEN.28<sup>22</sup> ( כְּתִיבִּיּוֹן ) the reader would expect Rashi to say - וּמִדְרָשׁוֹ כְּתִיבִּיּוֹן - "And its midrashic interpretation is like that of the Targum". Rashi, however, is not so particular in his stylistic expressions, and we may assume that if the "Derash" does no violence to the text then to Rashi it is in order to call it Peshat. cf. Rashi NUM.24<sup>4</sup> - פִּירוּשׁוֹ כְּתִיבִּיּוֹן - and NUM.24<sup>7</sup>. See also this Section, Group B, note 14 (infra) and 29 (infra). Regarding the conventional distinction between "Peshat" and "Derash", see Raphael Loewe, The Plain Meaning of Scripture in Early Jewish Exegesis, pp. 155-167 and 176 ff. See also Midrashic Section, Group E. (b, c and d).
19. Rashi, here, quotes first the midrashic interpretation of Onkelos and then that of the Midrash, cf. GEN.9<sup>27</sup>; GEN.6<sup>6</sup>. Sometimes, however, the order is vice versa, firstly the Midrash and then Onkelos' interpretation, e.g. GEN.22<sup>2</sup>; GEN.49<sup>27</sup>. We may, therefore, conclude that no significance can be attached to the above for Rashi did not write prefaces to his work nor indicate the premises upon which his interpretation rested. See General Introduction, p.32. Section Rashi as Philologist, ch.10, Rashi and the Text of Onkelos, footnote 4; Midrashic Section, Group B, notes 7, 12.

NOTESGROUP A

20. See GEN. Rabbah, ch.56,10:- רבי יוחנן אמר יהי רצון  
מלפניך וכו'.. בשעה שיהיו בניו של יצחק באים לידי עבירות  
ומעשים רעים תהא נזכר להם אותה העקירה ותתמלא רחמים  
עליהם.. רבי חלב אמר ער שהוא שלם עשה לו הקב"ה סוכה והיה מגבול בגנה  
... ומה היה אומר יהי רצון שאראה בבנין ביתי .

"Rabbi Johanan said: May it be thy will....that when  
Isaac's children are in trouble, Thou wilt remember  
that binding in their favour and be filled with  
compassion for them....Rabbi Helbo said: While it  
was yet Salem (Jerusalem) the Holy One blessed be He,  
made Himself a tabernacle and prayed in it, as it says.

In Salem also is set His Tabernacle, and His dwelling  
place in Zion. (Ps. 76<sup>3</sup>). And what did He say: O that  
I may see the building of the Temple".

Rabbi Helbo's interpretation is identical with that of  
Onkelos. Ps. Jonathan and the Palestinian Targum follow  
the Rabbis' interpretation. cf. LEV. Rabbah, ch.29, 9;  
Tanhuma Parashat Vayera, 23; Yalk. Shimoni 247, 101;  
Palestinian Talmud, Taa.ch.2, Halacha 4, Midrash  
Hagadol, op. cit. pp. 358-359.

21. LXX reads: accompanied by Ahazath his Chamberlain.
22. cf. Yalk.Shimoni Toledot, 111.

NOTESGROUP A

23. Perhaps Rashi did not see the purpose of quoting the Midrash, since Rabbi Nehemiah himself quoted Onkelos' interpretation.
24. This is also the interpretation of Ps. Jonathan, the Palest. Targum and Neofiti. Onkelos and Rashi seem to take - שִׁלְה - not only in the sense of King Messiah but also in the sense of - שְׁלו - his - (דְּוִלְיָה) - cf. GEN. Rabbah 99, 8 - יבוא עִלָּה - מִי שֶׁהַמַּלְכוּת עָלָיו. cf. Rab. Saadia Gaon, p.47; Rabbi D. Kamhi, op. cit. p.205; Nahmanides; Ibn Ezra. The Samaritan text reads - יבוא עִלָּה - The Vulgate reads: "donec veniat qui mittendus est". It appears that the Vulgate takes - שִׁלְה - in the sense of - עִלְיָה - See J. Komlosch, p.184. See Rabbi Samuel Ben Meir who rejects these interpretations: - וְלֹא שְׁלו כְּתוּב - כֹּהֵן כְּדַבְּרֵי הַעֲבָדִים וְלֹא עִלְיָה כְּדַבְּרֵי הַנוֹצְרִים. See D. Rosin, Interpretations on Rashbam's Commentary Breslau 1881, p.72. Also in Jahresbericht, Breslau 1880, p. 98.
25. See GEN. Rabbah 98, 8; ibid 97 - שִׁמְעָה מְדַעַרְדָּה - Bab.Tal. Sanh. p. 98<sup>b</sup> - רַבִּי רַבִּי שִׁמְעָה אָמַר עִלְיָה שְׁמוֹ שֶׁל מֶשִׁיחַ שְׁמֵאֵל עַד בִּיבּוֹא עִלְיָה. See Tanh. Vayehi, 10; Midrash Hadash, p.203; Yalk. Shimoni, p. 247; Lekah-Tov; Midrash Aggadah, v.1.p.111; Palest. Tal. Ber. ch.2, Halacha 4 - regarding the name of King Messiah; Midrash Hagadol. GEN, op.cit.p.843. See A.

25. (cont'd)

Poznanski, Schiloh, Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Messias Lehre; S.D. Luzzatto, On the Torah, pp. 194-196; J.

Komlosh, op.cit, p.183 - who quotes - מגלות מלכות יהודה -  
that Shiloh refers to King Messiah:- לא יסור עלינו משבט.

יהודה .. ער בא משיח הצדק, צמח דוד כי לו ולזרעו נתנה ברית  
מלכות עמו ער דורות עולם.

On the word "Shiloh", see further Nahmanides; Ibn Ezra;  
Rabenu Bachai, v.1, pp. 383-384; Rabbi I. Arama; Rabbi  
O. Sforno.

26. cf. Bab. Tal. Irub. 54<sup>b</sup> where this is referred to the scholars who ride from city to city and from district to district to learn Torah. Thus making the laws of the Torah shine - white as is the light at noonday.
27. Parashat Vayehi 10; cf. GEN.Rabbah, ch.98, 9;  
Midrash Hagadol, GEN. pp. 844-845; Midrash Aggadah.  
Buber, p.111.
28. Ps. Jonathan and the Palest. Targum take an independent line although both agree that the text refers to King Messiah.

661  
NOTES  
GROUP A

29. One can see from this verse as well as from verse 49<sup>12</sup> that Rashi was aware that Onkelos contains several interpretations in one verse without of course differentiating them by the formula - **דבר אחר** - "another interpretation". See Midrashic Section, Group C, note 28.
30. For further analyses of this subject, see Halachic Section and ch. "Summary".
31. See the Palest. Targum's interpretation. cf. Neofiti.
32. See Pirke Rabbi Eliezer, ch.39; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p. 856; GEN. Rabbah 98,18; Bab.Tal.Zeb.p.118<sup>b</sup>:-  
- **על עין - עין שלא רצתה לזון וליהנות מדבר שאינו שלו , תזכה ותאכל כמלא עינה.**  
cf. Ber.p.20<sup>a</sup>; Torah Shelemah, v.7, p.1841, para. 302; Rabbi Bachai's commentary on the Torah, v.1, p. 391.
33. op. cit. p. 857:- **ו'בן ורוץ ידיו - שעלה לבוש פן על זרועותיו**  
cf. Midrash Aggadah; Lekah-Tov.
34. N.E.B. takes **הרים** - in the sense of - **הורי** - mountains.

35. Onkelos:- דחמיו להון רברבא דמן עלמא - Ps. Jonathan/identifies specifically  
 "the great ones" - דחמיו להון רברבנ עלמא ישמעאל -  
 ועשו וכל בנהא דקטורא -

cf. Neofiti. The Palest. Targum takes - הורי - in the  
 sense of - קרי - "mountains". The Patriarchs are  
 compared to "mountains" and the Matriarchs to the  
 valleys:- אברהם ויצחק דמתילין לשוריא . . . . . ארבערבי -  
 אמהתא דמתילין בגלימתא שריה רבקה  
 רחל ורלל

The basic text for the identification of - קרי - to  
 - קיס ריב את ההרים - (ch.6<sup>1</sup>) - is Micah, - הורי -  
 ותשמענה הגבעות קולך .

"Up, state your case to the mountains; let the hills  
 hear your plea". Rabbi D. Kimhi in the name of  
 Jonathan's Targum (cf. Rashi) explains that the  
 "mountains" are the Patriarchs and the "hills" are the  
 Matriarchs. *see further this group A note 28*

36. See GEN. Rabbah 98,20:- ער תאות גבעות עולם - מר -  
 -Midrash Hagadol, GEN.op.cit. p.858:-  
 תאות גבעות עולם - אף ברכה עומד אברהם לברך ארד  
 יצחק ולא בירכו מפני ישמעאל כהיה לך שאן הרים וגבעות מלא מכות ואמהות -  
 cf. Mishnat Rabbi Eliezer, ch.15,p.284; Pesikta-de-Rab.  
 Kahana, p.199; GEN. Rabbah 61, 6; Tanhuma, Lech-Lecha,4;  
 ibid. Parashat Naso,9; Tanhuma, Buber, Lech Lecha,5;  
 ibid. Parashat Naso 17; NUM.Rabbah,11,2; GEN.Rabbah 39,11;  
 Rashi GEN.25<sup>1</sup>.



NOTESGROUP A

37. See GEN. Rabbah 98,20; Midrash Hagadol, GEN.op.cit. pp. 858-859; Midrash Aggadah, v.1, p. 115:-  
 - נזיר אחיו - זה יוסף שהיה פורע מאחיו.
38. cf. Ps. Jonathan:- יתכנסו כל מלך ברכיה ויתעבדו כליל דרבו לריש יוסף.  
 "Let all these blessings come (lit.- כנס - to gather) and make a diadem of majesty upon the head of Joseph".  
 cf. the Palest. Targum and Neofiti. See also Ibn Ezra and Samuel Ben Meir's commentary - נזיר אחיו- מלך על אחיו.
39. cf. Midrash Aggadah, v.1, p.115; Bab.Tal.Shab.p.139<sup>a</sup>; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. op.cit. p.859; Siphre, DEUT. Piska 353; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT.33<sup>16</sup>, p. 858.
40. cf. Midrash Tanhuma, Parashat Vayehi 14; cf. also GEN. Rabbah, Parasha 99, 3.
41. cf. Tanhuma, ibid:- דבר אחר, בעמין ואב יסף- מרבר בקרבנות - בבקר יאכל ער- את הכבש אחר תעשה בבקר וכל ולערב יאכל עלל- ואת הכבש השני תעשה בין הערבית וכל...  
 cf. GEN. Rabbah ibid; Midrash<sup>Hagadol</sup>/GEN. op.cit. p. 864; Midrash Sechel Tov, p. 326; Midrash Aggadah, p. 115; Lekah-Tov; Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti. To Onkelos the

41. (cont'd).

word - **זאב** - is taken in the sense of - **מזבח** - "altar".

cf. GEN. Rabbah 93, para.3 - **רבי פנחס פתר קריא**

**במזבח, מה הוא? הוה מושף נך היה המזבח**

**מושף את הקרבנות**

See B. Bechar - **ערבי מורש** - v.3, p.323. See also Bab.

Tal.Suc. p. 56<sup>b</sup> - **כשננטסו... בילגה וכו'..**

**ינע להיכל היתה מבצטת בסנדלה על גבי המזבח, ואמרה**

**לוקוס לוקוס (זאב) ער מתי אפה מכלה מקונון של ישראל**

**ואי אפה צומד עליהן בשעת הדחק.**

Onkelos' view that in the land of Benjamin the Sanctuary

will be built - **is also** - **ובאחסנדיה יתבט מקדשא**

found in Siphre, DEUT. Piska 352: - **מלמד שבית המקדש**

**היה בנוי בחלקו של בנימין וכו'...**

cf. also GEN. Rabbah, 93, 12; ibid, 99,1; Bab.Tal. Yoma,

p.12<sup>a</sup>; Zeb. p.118<sup>b</sup>; Meg.26<sup>a</sup>; Encyclopaedia-Ha-Ivrit,v.9,

p.137 ff. Mechilta - **6-מסכתא ויהי בטלח** - See also

Benjamin's will - 9,2 - **in** - **ואולם מקדש ה' בחלקם יהי**

A. Kahana - **v.1, p.214.** - **הספרי' החצוני' -**

42. There are, however, different versions in Onkelos. See

Nahmanides, who quotes some of them. See A. Sperber;

S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. pp.49-50; N. Adler, Netinah-Lager.

NOTESGROUP A

43. cf. N.E.B. "But beware there is trouble in store for you".  
 cf. Ps. Jonathan:- מִמֶּנּוּ אֶחָד לְבָקֵלָא בִּישָׁא הוּא לְכֹן לְקַבֵּל -  
 - cf. Neofiti and A. Ibn Ezra. אֶפְיָכוֹן בְּאֹרֶחַ כּוֹן -  
 Rabbi Samuel-Ben-Meir seems to interpret differently -  
 - "You devise evil in your heart" - אַתָּה מוֹשֵׁב בְּרָעָה בְּלִבְבְּכֶם -  
 heart".
44. EX. Rabbah, 13,5.
45. The Palestinian Targum and Neofiti translate - מִן "נין -  
 "armed". See section, Rashi as Philologist, ch. 5 note  
 3.
46. Parashat Beshalach; cf. Yalk.Shimoni, 227; Midrash  
 Hagadol. EX. pp.248-249.
47. cf. Ps. Jonathan and the Palestinian Targum. See  
 Nahmanides. Neofiti interprets differently.
48. cf. Midrash Tanhuma; Yalk.Shimoni, 242; Midrash Hagadol,  
 EX. pp.287-288; Mechilta, Parasha 2; Mechilta de Rabbi  
 Shimon; Bab. Tal.Chag.13<sup>b</sup>:- אָמַר רִישׁ לְקִישׁ שִׁירָה עַל מִי  
 שֶׁמִּתְגַּמֵּחַ עַל הַגִּמְיָם דְּאָמַר מִי מֵלֵךְ עֲבָחוּת אֲרִי מֵלֵךְ עֲבָחוּת  
 שׁוֹר, מֵלֵךְ עֲבָחוּת נֶשֶׁר וְאִדָּה מִתְגַּמֵּחַ עֲלֵיהֶן וְהִקְבֵּה מִתְגַּמֵּחַ  
 עַל בּוֹלֵן וְעַל בֵּל הַעוֹלָם בּוֹלֵן.

NOTESGROUP A

49. (Vienna 1870) Beshalach, Parasha 3 - רבי יוסי בן דורמסקית -  
אומר מעשה לפנינו מקדש ואין נזה אלא בית המקדש שנאמר  
ואת נזהו השמנו וכו'... כבי עקיבא אומר מדבר בנאותיו ושבויו  
על הקבה בפני כל אמות העולם וכו'...

cf. also Yalk. Shimoni, 244; Mechilta Rabbi Shimon;  
Midrash Hagadol, EX. p.292; Ps. Jonathan, the  
Palestinian Targum, LXX and Neofiti follow Rabbi Akiva.  
This is also the interpretation of the Vulgate -  
"Glorificabo eum".

50. Mechilta de Rabbi Ishmael, Beshalach - מספרהא דשריירא -  
op. cit. p. 40. cf. Mechilta de Rabbi Shimon; Midrash  
Hagadol, EX. op. cit. p. 300. See Section, Rashi as  
Philologist ch. 5 note 4.

51. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti, however, translate - איתעבדו -  
- היא קורמן קורמן - "The waters were made into  
manifold heaps". cf. the Vulgate "Congregatae sunt aquae".  
See J. Komlosch, p.195; L. Ginsberg, Legends, v.6, p. 110.

52. The exact words of Onkelos are: - ארי בפדגמא דחשיבו מצראי -  
למרון יחד ישראל ביה דנינון -  
Rashi, having in mind the Mechilta's comment translated -  
- לאבדו - by - דנינון -.

NOTES  
GROUP A

53. cf. Mechilta Yithro, Parasha 2 - מכירו ה'ה לשעבר ועביו  
ביתר שנה גדל שמו בעולם שבמה שחשבו מצרים  
לאבד את ישראל בו נפרץ מהם המקום שנאמר  
כי בדבר אשר ורו עליהם.

See Mechilta, Beshalach, Parasha 6 (with regard to EX.15<sup>a</sup>)  
where the punishment of water is clearly specified:-

נערמו מים - במדה שמרדו מרדת להם, הם אמרו הבה  
נתחכמה לו אף אתה נתתה ערמה למים, וכו' המים נלחמים בהם...

cf. Midrash Hagadol, EX. p.300; Bab.Tal.Sot.p.11<sup>a</sup> -

"בקרירה עבישלו בה נתבשלו וכו'..."

cf. Pesikta-de-Rab Kahana (Buber). p.82<sup>a</sup>. L.Finkelstein,  
Studies in the Tannaitic Midrashim, P.A.A.J.R. 6-1934-1935.  
p.207. See Midrashic Section, Group D, note 2.

54. cf. Rashi, EX.34<sup>7</sup>.

55. Bab.Tal.Sanh. p.27<sup>b</sup>. cf. Mechilta, Yithro, Parasha 6;  
Yalk. Shimon, p.290; Midrash Hagadol, op.cit.  
pp. 406-407; Bab.Tal. Ber. p.7<sup>a</sup>; Jonathan's Targum,  
Jer. ch.32<sup>18</sup>. cf. Rashi, Onkelos, Ps. Jonathan and  
Neofiti on LEV.26<sup>39</sup>; Siphra Behukotai, 8; Midrashic  
Section, Group C, notes 40 and 50; Midrashic Section,  
Group D, note 3.

## NOTES

GROUP A

56. cf. Bab.Tal.Sot.p.15<sup>b</sup>.

57. See NUM. Rabbah 9, 14: - ולקח הכהן מים קדושים - אין מים קדושים אלא שנתקדשו בכלי וכך ולמה היו המים מן הכיור לפי שהכיור לא נעשה אלא מן מראות הנשים וכך...  
See Midrash Hagadol, EX. op.cit. pp.757-758.

58. cf. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti who both interpret that the righteous women used to pray at the Temple. In other words they had given up all earthly matters and came to the Temple for prayers and instruction. See Rabbi A. Ibn Ezra: - והנה היו בישראל נשים קובלות השם עשרו מתאות זה הקולם ונתנו מראותיהן נובה כי אין להם צורך עוד להתיבות יק באות יום יום אל פתח אהל מועד להפיל ולשמוע דברי רמב"ם.

The Palest. Targum however merely reads - בחזרת נשיא - see M. Cassuto, EX. p. 326; Nahmanides; Rabbenu Bachai; N. Adler, Netinah-Lager; S.B.Schefftel, Biure Onkelos.

59. N.E.B. takes - וה"ר לנו לעיניך - figuratively, hence, "And you will be our guide".

NOTESGROUP A

60. Siphre (M. Friedman) Vienna, 1864; Piska 80; p.21:-  
 "אמר ליה אחר שלא ראה נסים וגבורות במקדש ויטח וילך  
 כנא הוא הדבר, אתה שראית תטח ותלך וכו'.. לא והיית לנו  
 לעינים - מפילו אין דינים אלא שכל דבר ודבר שנתעלה  
 מעיניו תהיה מאר עיניו בו וכו'.. לא שפכה חביב קלינו כגלגל  
 עינים שנאמר ואהבהם את הגר.  
 cf. Yalk. Shimoni, Behaalotcha, 726; Midrash Hagadol,  
 NUM. p. 152.
61. Parashat Behaalotecha, Piska 95; - ולא יסו-נהגבא לבי שעה ופסקו -  
 cf. Midrash Hagadol, NUM. p. 180; Siphre Zuta,  
 Behaalotecha, Piska 25 (ed. Horowitz) p.272; Tanhuma,  
 Buber, v.2. p.57.
62. cf. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti - מתנבאין ולא פסקין -  
 see further this Group, note 31 on DEUT.5<sup>19</sup>.
63. cf. Tanhuma, Buber, v.2. p. 57; Rashi DEUT. ch.5<sup>19</sup>;  
 L. Ginzberg, Legends, v.6. p. 88, note 481. See  
 Section Veneration, Group C, note 3.
64. This is the translation of the Soncino Chumash edited  
 by A. Cohen, Eleventh Impression, London 1974. N.E.B.  
 however translates as follows: "The spring unearthed by  
 the princes.....a gift from the wilderness.(v.19).And  
 they proceeded from Beer(Heb.from gift)to Nahaliel".....

## NOTES

## GROUP A

65. Ps. Jonathan, the Palest. Targum and Neofiti explain the "princes" to mean the Patriarchs Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and - נדב'י קה - by - ספר'א - who are Moses and Aaron. Onkelos also can be explained in the light of the Palestinian Targumim. See J. Komlosh, p. 201.
66. See Tanhuma (Levine Epstein) Jerusalem, 1969. Parashat Hukath, 21:- באר חפזוה שריש - ואמדבר מדבר - שנתנה להם מתנה במדבר לעמאן -  
cf. also NUM.Rabbah, ch.19, 26; Midrash Hagadol. NUM. op. cit. p. 389: - תנא באר שנתנה לכן לישראל במדבר -  
עולה עמאן הריש זורדת בקעות וכו'...  
GEN. Rabbah, ch.70, 8; Tofefta Suc.ch.3, Halacha 11. The "well" can also be taken in the sense of "Torah" and Onkelos alludes to this. See I. Heinemann - דרכי האגדה - p. 152.
67. See Midrash Rabbah, ch.20, 18:- זעלהו במות בעל פעור -  
שראה ישראל נופלין עבד.  
cf. Yalk. Shimoni, 765, 87; Ps. Jonathan- ואסקה לומה וחללא ופעור.  
NUM. Rabbah, ch.20, 18. Midrash Hagadol NUM.op.cit. p.409 reads as follows:- במות בעל - זו בית גליא עלהן -  
(from - גלי - revelation - Temple for oracles).  
See Bab.Tal.Ab.Zar.46<sup>a</sup> - היו קורין אותה בית גליא קורין אותה בית כרכיא.  
When the idolators call their Temple "Beth-Galia", the Israelites should call it "Beth-Kharria". cf. Bab.Tal.



GROUP A

67. (cont'd).

Tem. 28<sup>b</sup>; Meg. 6<sup>a</sup>; Tosefta Ab. Zar. ch.7. On this word

- א' ל - See M. Jastrow, v.1.p.248.

68. Parashat Balak 12, cf. NUM. Rabbah, Balak, ch.20, 19.  
Yalk. Shimon, Balak, 766.

69. Perhaps, however, Rashi felt that the midrashic interpretation of the Rabbis is more appropriate on the words - " וּבְגִי'ת לֹא יִתְחַטֵּב " - as the Targum has it, and this is why Rashi quotes Onkelos.

70. See Rashi - NUM.23<sup>9</sup> - who alludes to this Midrash.  
*See this comp footnote (supra) 35.*

71. Taan. ch.4, Halacha 5; cf. Lamentations Rabbah, ch.2, 5;  
Midrash Lekah-Tov, pp.129-130; J. Komlosch, p.202.

72. This is the translation of the "Soncino Chumash" edited by A. Cohen, London 1974. The N.E.B. translates as follows: "He uttered his oracle: Ah, who are these assembling in the north...". This translation presupposes  
*לְאִמְרָתוֹ - For - אִתְּ - לְאִמְרָתוֹ*

NOTES  
GROUP A

73. See Bab.Tal.Sanh. p.106<sup>a</sup>; Midrash Hagadol, NUM. op.cit. pp. 432-433; Rabbi Ibn Ezra believes that - אל - is not referring to God, but to the King of Assyria who made himself as God - מי יחיה - השעם על מלך אשור שעש נפשו כמו אל - Rabbi Samuel Ben Meir translates - מי יחיה - מבט מלך המשיח - בשומו הקב"ה אל"ה הדברים.
- Ps. Jonathan takes it as Onkelos: - ואמר וי מאן יתקיים - בזמן דיתגלי מלכא דה' למתן אגר פבב לצדקיא ומתפרץא מן רשעיא - cf. the Palest. Targum and Neofiti. (*this note 30 is misplaced and it should be in group C.*)
74. cf. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti; Nahmanides and Rabbi S. Ben Meir. See also this ch. note 25 (on NUM.11<sup>35</sup>).
75. From this verse Rabbi Johanan deduces that in the time to come all the books of the prophets will be abolished except the five Books of Moses: אמר רבי יוחנן הנביאים והכתובים: עתידין ליבטל וחמשת ספרי תורה מיין עתידין ליבטל, מאי טעמא קול גדול ולא יסו.
- See the Palest. Tal. Meg.ch.1, Halacha 1; Ephraim E. Urbach, The Sages, p. 274.
76. Onkelos: - ספיק צרכיהון בארץא מדברא ובית צחונא אתר די לית - מיא, אשרינון סחור סחור לשכנתיה אלפנון על פתגמי אור-יחדא נטרינון כבבד עינרדיון.
- Onkelos treats - יִמְצְאוּהוּ - as if it were - יִמְצְאוּהוּ - the Hiphil of - מִצָּא. Onkelos, here moderated the apparent

NOTESGROUP A

76. (cont'd).

anthropomorphism and translated - כַּבֵּת עֵינֵהוּ - and guarded them as the pupil of their eye and not as the pupil of His (God's) eye. See Section on Anthropomorphism, Group B. References on Human Form and Organ, note 7.

77. DEUT. pp. 705-706. cf. also Yalk. Shimoni, p. 943; Lekah-Tov; Midrash Hagadol, NUM. p.3. Ps. Jonathan, the Palest. Targum and Neofiti translate differently from Onkelos.

78. See Siphre, Hazineu, Piska 315; Lekah-Tov; Midrash Tannaim, p. 192; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. op. cit. p. 707.

79. The wording is ambiguous and it is hard to tell whether Onkelos meant - עוֹלָם הַבָּא - "the Hereafter" - or - לְיָמֵי -  
- הַמָּשִׁיחַ - the Messianic times. Most likely the latter as can be seen from the continuation of his interpretation, i.e. the eradication of the worship of idols. See Maimonides Mishne-Torah;- הַלְכוֹת מַלְכֵי כָּסֶה פֶּרֶק י"א. ד.  
The other Targumim, Ps. Jonathan, the Palest. Targum and Neofiti do not follow Onkelos. They simply state that God will make them dwell alone in their own land. Ps. Jonathan reads:- מִיָּמָרָא דֵּה' בְּלִמְדֵּיהוֹן יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּאַרְעֵהוֹן -  
It is interesting to note that whilst Onkelos takes

NOTESGROUP A

79. (cont'd).

- 772- as referring to God ( ה' גדד ) - the other Targumim take - 777- as referring to the suffix of - ואין עמו אל נפר - ; the parallelism - as well as the - מעמיה - support the Targumim. However, some read in Onkelos - בלחודיהו - and not - בלחודיהו. See N. Adler, Netinah-Lager.

80. cf. Ps. Jonathan; the Palest. Targum; Neofiti; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. p.713.

81. It is true, however, that Onkelos' interpretation is inadequate to convey the full meaning of the text. Rashi therefore takes the opportunity of quoting and explaining him. See this Section, Group D, note 6. See Section Anthropomorphism Group I note 8

82. See Rashi DEUT.32<sup>43</sup> - who quotes the two opinions.

83. See Siphre, Hāzinu, Piska 323; Midrash Tannaim. p.199; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. p. 723.

84. See N. Adler, Netinah-Lager. From the verse DEUT.32<sup>35</sup> one can further deduce that Onkelos follows the opinion of Rabbi Judah:- לַעֲתָת תִּמּוֹט רַגְלָם - "Their foot shall totter in due time".

675  
NOTES  
GROUP A

84. (cont'd)

Onkelos interprets:- - קרמי פרענותא ואנא אשליח לערן  
דיגלון מאר עירדון -

"The punishment is before Me, and I will repay in the time of their dispersion (exile) from their land". The exile from their land can only refer to Israel. Rashi follows Onkelos' interpretation and in verse 34 he says clearly - - כתר גומן -

85. See Nahmanides who remarks that Onkelos did not suppress the naive conception - God's right hand. See N. Adler, Netinah-Lager. See section The Anti-Anthropomorphisms, Group B. References to Human Form and Organs, note 12.

86. It appears that the Targumim and other classical commentators have taken - אשדד - as two words. However, Abu Omar Ibn Jakwa, the Spanish commentator of the 10th century takes it as one word - (cf. DEUT. 3<sup>17</sup> - אשדת הנסגה) and signifies a "place". See W. Bacher, Die Jüdische Bibelexegese, Trier 1892, p.21 - quoted by J. Komlosch, The Bible in the Light of the Aramaic Translations, p.206. Grammatically speaking, if the word - דת - means the Torah, then one would expect - דת אש - and not - אשדד - . The - כתיב - in fact, refers to the place - אשדד - parallel to - אשדד , פארן - and - סיט - . The only

86. (cont'd).

place where the word - לר - is found in the Bible is in the Book of Esther, (ch.1<sup>15</sup> and ch.1<sup>8</sup>) - כרת מה לעשות - which is quite late. The English translation of the text in question is taken from The Pentateuch with Rashi's commentary. The N.E.B. however, does not take - אש דת - as referring to the Torah: "He showed himself from Mount Paran, and with him were myriads of holy ones streaming along at his right hand".

87. Parashat Vezot-Haberacha, Piska 343. cf. Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. p. 754; - אמר רבי שמעון בן לקיש, התורה של אש - מימי אש דת והסרסור נעשו פניו של אש, ויראו מגעת אליו (שמות לה. ל.) והמלאכים שירדו עמו אש, מערתיו אש לוהט (תה' קד. ד.) וההר בוער באש, וניתנה מאצ וכו'...
- See DEUT. Rabbah, ch.3, 12; Palest. Tal. Shekalim, ch.6, Halacha 1; Palest. Tal. Sot. ch.8, Halacha 3; Aboth de Rabbi Nathan, ch. 43 - נוסח ב' -

88. cf. EX.19<sup>18</sup>; the Palest. Targum and Neofiti. These Targumim elaborate on the fact that the Almighty offered the Torah to the sons of Esau and Ishmael, but they refused to accept it.

NOTESMIDRASH - GROUP B

1. See Introduction to the Midrashic Section.
2. Ps. Jonathan reads:- *ואבנא דגא דעוית קמא תהי מסדרא*  
*בבי מקדשא... ויהון דגא פלמן עולה.*  
 Neofiti *דגא דעוית קיימא יהווי בית מקדשא לשמה דה' - Neofiti*  
*פלא - Links Onkelos with these Targumim.*
3. See Rabbi D. Kimhi on the Torah, p.151.
4. cf. Ps. Jonathan; Rashi and Onkelos, GEN.46<sup>34</sup>. Neofiti, however, translates literally.
5. See the Pentateuch, J.H. Hertz, London, Soncino Press, 1961 on this ch. note 32.
6. Ps. Jonathan and the Palest. Targum translate differently. GEN. Rabbah, Tanhuma and other Midrashim also make different comments on the text. GEN. Rabbah - 97 refers the text to "King Messiah". cf. Lekah-Tov, p. 235. See Midrash Aggadah, Buber, p. 110:- *בתחלה גור בשלטון*  
*ולבסוף אריר כמלך.*  
 Perhaps, therefore, Rashi's source is the Midrash Aggadah and Rashi merely states that Onkelos is in line with the Midrash's interpretation. However, the Midrash Aggadah does not identify either the whelp or the lion, with King David. In GEN. Rabbah ( *עשה קדערה* ) 97, we

6. (cont'd).
- read - אמר רבי חמא ברבי חנינא זה משיח בן דוד.  
 "Rabbi Hama said this is the Messiah, the son of David".  
 cf. Midrash Lekah-Tov, p.235. Onkelos, most likely, had  
 in mind King David and the King Messiah, as indeed Rashi  
 interprets.
7. Tanhuma; GEN. Rabbah and other Midrashim offer a  
 different interpretation than that of Onkelos.
8. Ps. Jonathan and the Palest. Targumim interpret the text  
 as having reference to King Messiah. On the words - ולבן.  
 - וְאֶת־בֶּן־אָמִי - however, they seem to agree with Onkelos'  
 interpretation. cf. Neofiti. See Midrashic Section, Group  
 E (b), note 1.
9. One can see from this verse as well as from GEN.49<sup>11</sup>  
 that Rashi was aware that Onkelos' Targum contain  
 several interpretations in one single verse. See  
 General Introduction, p. 27. Also Midrashic Section,  
 Group A, note 10.
10. cf. I. SAM. 14<sup>4</sup> and Rashi on - פִּי הַרְרֹת -  
 EX.14<sup>2</sup> - where the reference there is to the valley  
 between the rocks.



NOTESGROUP B

11. See GEN. Rabbah, 99, 9; *ibid* 72, 5; *ibid* 98, 12;  
LEV. Rabbah, 25, 2; NUM. Rabbah 13, 17; Tanh. Vayehi 11.
12. Rashi DEUT. ch. 33<sup>18</sup>.
13. cf. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti.
14. It is quite common for Onkelos' Targum to offer two interpretations in one verse. cf. Rashi, GEN. ch. 49<sup>11-12</sup>.  
See this Group, note 4 and *infra* 9.
15. cf. GEN. Rabbah, 98 12; *ibid* 99, 10; Bab. Tal. Ber. 5<sup>a</sup>;  
Midrash Aggadah, v. 1, p. 112; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p. 848;  
Ps. Jonathan; L. Ginsberg, Legends, v. 5, p. 368; Tanhuma  
Vayehi 11; Midrashic Section, Group C, note 30.
16. S.B. Schefftel Biure Onkelos, p. 74 - believes that  
Onkelos does not take חמר - חמר - in its literal sense but  
rather in the sense of EX. ch. 8<sup>10</sup> - וַיִּצְבְּרוּ אֵת חֲמֵר חֲמֵר  
(חֲמֵר) - "And they piled them up in heaps".  
(cf. JUDG. 15<sup>16</sup>). Perhaps out of consideration to  
Isaachar's honour, Onkelos takes it in the sense of  
"wealth". See Section Veneration and Idealization of  
the Patriarch's sons, Group B, note 9, footnote 50.

NOTES  
GROUP B

17. A. Geiger Hamikra-Ve-Targumav, op.cit.p.232 - suggests that Ps. Jonathan's version in the biblical text was -  $\text{הָאֵלֹהִים אֱהָבָה לְלִמּוּד}$  (he loves to learn, -  $\text{הָאֵלֹהִים}$  - is the Aramaic verb for -  $\text{לִמּוּד}$  -) and not -  $\text{הָאֵלֹהִים אֱהָבָה}$ . Geiger, however, brings no support to his suggestion, which is far fetched.
18. Perhaps Ps. Jonathan had in mind I.CHRON. ch.12<sup>32</sup> -  $\text{וּמִבְּנֵי יִשְׁשַׁכָּר יֹדְעֵי בִּנְיָה לְעֵרְיָה$  - cf. GEN. Rabbah 72,5.
19. See also NUM.21<sup>28</sup> where Onkelos interprets midrashically, but Rashi makes no comment on his interpretation. cf. GEN.49<sup>8</sup>; DEUT.32<sup>6</sup>; DEUT.32<sup>36</sup>; DEUT.33<sup>7</sup>; DEUT.33<sup>9</sup>; DEUT.33<sup>12</sup>; DEUT.33<sup>14</sup>; DEUT.33<sup>18</sup>; DEUT.33<sup>20</sup>; DEUT.33<sup>21</sup>.
20. cf. GEN. Rabbah, ch.98,12; Tanhuma, Parashat Vayehi,11; Midrash Hagadol GEN. p.848; Bab.Tal.Ber.p.5<sup>a</sup>; Midrash Aggadah, v.1, p.112. cf. Ps. Jonathan, Neofiti and the Palest. Targum. Most probably Onkelos had before him a different tradition on the text. See Midrashic Section, Group C, note 30.
21. -  $\text{וְחֹזֵא חֹלְקָא אֲרִי טַב וְיֵת אֲרָצָא אֲרִי מַעְבְּדָא פִּירִין וְיַכְבֵּשׁ מַחוּזִין$   
 $\text{עֲמִיּוֹא וְיִשְׁעִי יֵת צִיְרִיהוֹן, וְדֹאשְׁתֵּא דְרוֹן בְּהוֹן יְהוֹן לִיה בְּלַחִין}$   
 $\text{וּמִסְקִי מִסִּין}$

21. (cont'd).

Rashi quotes the interpretation of the Midrash before that of Onkelos. But no rules or conclusions can be derived from this as in other instances Rashi quotes Onkelos before that of the Midrash (e.g. GEN. 49<sup>21</sup>). Rashi works unsystematically and his main objective is to make the Hebrew text intelligible to the student of the Torah. On this subject, see General Introduction, p.32. See further this Group, note 12, infra 38.

22. Onkelos takes an independent line, as nowhere in the Midrashim or the Targumim available to us is his interpretation found. Ps. Jonathan, the Palest. Targum and Neofiti interpret like the midrashic interpretation of the Rabbis in treatise Sot. cf. Pirke de-Rabbi Eliezer, ch.39; Yalk.Shimoni, Parashat Vayehi, 247; Midrash Aggadah, v.1. p.113; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p.853. Tanhuma, Vayehi, 13; Bab.Tal.Pes.p.8<sup>b</sup>; Ber.44<sup>a</sup>. Perhaps Ps. Jonathan had in mind Onkelos' interpretation: -  
וַיִּפְתָּח הוּא פִּתְחוֹ -  
פִּתְחוֹ בְּבִנְיָמִן דִּישְׂרָאֵל לְמַשְׁבַּח מַבְחָר מִכָּל לְשׁוֹנָא -  
"And when he opened his mouth in the congregation of Israel to give praise, he was the chosen above all tongues". Similarly, in GEN. Rabbah, 97 (ע'ט"ז חלש)  
לְשׁוֹנֵי עַל בְּנֵי עַבְדֵּי נִפְתְּלוּ בְּתוֹרָה מִתּוֹקָה כְּדָבָר...  
- וְכַעֲהוּא פִתְחָ בְּבִנְיָמִן דִּישְׂרָאֵל לְמַשְׁבַּח מַבְחָר מִכָּל לְשׁוֹנָא -  
Similarly Neofiti: - חֲלָבָא וְדוּבְשָׁא נִפְקָ מִשְׁפִּירֵי יִרְדְּ -  
On this subject, see, Ginsberg, Legends, v.5, p.369,

## NOTES

GROUP B

22. (cont'd).

note 396. See Midrash Tehillim, Ps. 81<sup>4</sup>, Buber, p. 366:-

אמר רבי יוסי בן יעקב ב"ר א"ר בשם רבי אחא נפתלי  
א"ל שלומה שהם קלים במעלה ונדרה של  
נדרה בא"ל.

Rabbi Josi takes - א"ל - in the sense of "hind"  
and not as the N.E.B. cf. Rab. Saadia Gaon, p. 48. On the  
alertness of Naphtali, see A. Kahana:- הספרים המצוננים

כרך א' עמ' קצב.

23. Rashi, after saying - כדרגומן - and quoting the Derash  
of the Rabbis, goes on to say - ויתרמי ערביה, יפל -  
מבלי, והוא יודה על חלקו אמרים נאים ושבחים -

"The words in the Targum mean his lot shall fall [so  
that the second half of the verse would mean], he will  
give thanks for his fortune with pleasing words and with  
praise". The order of Rashi is strange for one would  
expect Rashi to translate the Targum right at the  
beginning where he quoted it. See this Group, note 21.

24. This translation is taken from "The Pentateuch with  
Rashi's Commentary". N.E.B. however, translates as  
follows:- "But their bow was splintered by the Eternal  
and the sinews of their arms were torn apart (or the arms  
of his hands were active) by the power of the strong one  
of Jacob by the name of the shepherd of Israel". The verse,  
however, is in the singular and refers to Joseph.

25. Onkelos - וְהִבְרֵךְ - implies - וְקָשָׁב (from שׁוּב) and not - וְקָשָׁב - from - יָרַב = יָעַב ; the Aramaic for which would be - וְהִבְרֵךְ .
26. Rashi deliberately points out that there are "additional comments" on the part of Onkelos which do not form part of the text, thus dispelling any conjecture that Onkelos might have had a different version in the biblical text. cf. Rashi EX.16<sup>14</sup>. See General Introduction, pp.27-28. A similar concept is mentioned in Bab.Tal.Sot.10<sup>b</sup> - "אמר רבי שמעון חסידא יוסף שקידע שם - עמיד בסתר זכה וכוסיבו לו אות אחת משמו של הקב"ה וכו'... שנאמר ערוך ב'היוסף שמו .
- See also Zeb. p.118<sup>b</sup>.
27. See Midrashic Section, Group A, note 12.
28. The Targumim, Ps. Jonathan, the Palest. Targum and Neofiti do not follow Onkelos' Targum. With regard to the abbreviation of - אב ובן - the Midrash Lekah-Tov, Parashat, Vayehi, 24, p.240 - interprets like Onkelos. However, Midrash Aggadah, v.7. p.114 follows the interpretation of the Rabbis.
29. cf. GEN. Rabbah, ch.98,20; Palest. Tal. Hor.ch.2, Halacha 5; Pirke Rabbi Eliezer, ch.39; Yalk.Shimoni, 247; Midrash Hagadol; GEN. op.cit. p.668 and p. 857.

NOTES  
GROUP B

30. Rashi quotes Onkelos without acknowledgment.
31. Rashi's own elaboration of what Onkelos meant is of course entirely arbitrary. We have nothing in Onkelos himself to suggest this.
32. Rashi has in mind the idiomatic meaning of: - שהזרץ  
"ררר כחץ -"
33. Ps. Jonathan translates - -בריכין יהון חר"א דינקת מנרדון -  
ומעייא דרבצת בהון -
- Blessed are the breasts that suckled thee and the womb in which thou didst lie. cf. the Palest. Targum and Neofiti who take these words literally. cf. GEN.Rabbah, ch.98,20 - -רבי אבא בר זוטרא אמר בוא וראה ער היכן ח"בב -  
אבינו יעקב את רחל אפילו בשעה שבא לברך את בנה עצמו שפיל לה  
ברכות שליש ורח"ש - יתברכון דליא דהכי אונקו ומעייא דהכי אפ"ק -
- Rabbi Abba Ben Zutra said: Go forth and see how much Jacob loved Rachel. Even when he came to bless her son, he treated him merely as an accessory saying: "Blessings of the breasts and of the womb, which means, blessed be the breasts that suckled such and the womb whence issued such". cf. GEN. Midrash Hagadol, op.cit. p.858.
- According to P. Churgin, American Journal of Semitics Languages and Literature, 50 (1933-34) p.60 - Onkelos

NOTESGROUP B

33. (cont'd)

takes - שד"ב - in the sense of "father" because most probably the end of this verse was fused with the beginning of the following verse - ברכות אב"ך .

34. - ויחזו - היו מסתכלין בו בלב גס מתוך אכילה ושתייה כך מרוש  
רבי תנחומא ואונקלוס לא תרגם כן.

35. cf. LEV. Rabbah 20,10 - מלמד שזנו עיניהם מן השכינה  
ויחזו את האלהים כאדם המביט בחבירו מתוך מאכל ומשתה .

Perhaps Rashi is not careful here and means to endorse the simile in LEV. Rabbah - כאדם המביט -

This is why I have translated "as though their association etc." It is interesting to note that Rashi's explanation in the name of Rabbi Tanhuma is nowhere found in Tanhuma Lewin Epstein (Jerusalem 1969) nor in Tanhuma Buber (Vilna 1913). In LEV. Rabbah, however, Rabbi Tanhuma gives a different explanation altogether: - ויחזו - אמר רבי

תנחומא מלמד שפרצו את ראשיהן וג'סו לבם וזנו עיניהם מן השכינה .

cf. also NUM.Rabbah 2, 25: - אמר רבי תנחומא מלמד שהג'סו  
אדם לבן ועמדו על רגליהם וזנו עיניהם מן השכינה -

See BabTal.Ber.17<sup>a</sup>. See General Introduction, p.36 ff.

NOTESGROUP B

36. The same interpretation is given by Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti.
37. cf. Section, Veneration of Aaron and the Priests, Group D, note 2.
38. Some commentators on Rashi would like us to believe that if Rashi quotes Onkelos' interpretation first and then that of the Midrash, it is a sign that Rashi favours Onkelos' interpretation, and if vice versa then Rashi favours the Midrash. On this subject see this Group, note 7, footnote 21; General Introduction, p.32; Midrashic Section, Group A, note 7, footnote 19.
39. cf. Tanhuma Balak 12; GEN. Rabbah, 20, 19.
40. cf. Neofiti.
41. The Pentateuch with Rashi's commentary. N.E.B. reads:  
 or number the hordes of Israel. The N.E.B. amends -  
 וְיִסְמְרוּ - in phrase of - וְיִסְמְרוּ - in parallel  
 to - כִּי קָנָה -



687  
NOTES  
GROUP B

42. cf. Palest. Targum:- מ' יכלי לממט עולמיהון דבית יעקב -  
דאתמר עליהון די הוו סגין כבוכבי שמיא ובד'...
- cf. Neofiti. Ps. Jonathan makes a reference to the foreskin of the circumcision which the Israelites buried in the "dust" of the earth. cf. Pirke Rabbi Eliezer, ch.39; Midrash Hagadol, NUM.p.417.
43. cf. Midrash Tanhuma, Balak,12; Tanhuma Buber Balak 20; NUM. Rabbah 20,19; Midrash Hagadol, NUM. p.417; Midrash Aggadah,Buber, v.2, p.139.
44. cf. Ps. Jonathan. the Palest. Targum and Neofiti offer Onkelos' interpretation on the second part of the verse - "Neither hath he seen trouble in Israel". The Midrash Hagadol NUM. p.419, alludes to Onkelos' Derash, but Z.M. Rabinowitz' comments (in his glosses) that - מקורו נעלם -  
"the source of the Midrash is unknown".
45. In other words, the Peshat here for Rashi seems to consist of the possibility of translating - לא דביט -  
as meaning: "God has not concerned himself to see with

NOTESGROUP B

45. (cont'd).

exactitude". It is interesting to note that when the Midrashic interpretation does no violence to the text, Rashi is inclined, as in this instance, to call it "Peshat". See Midrashic Section, Group A, note 7. And this Group, note 18. Also Midrashic Section, Group E.(d) "Rashi's Occasional Reversion to the Talmudic Concept".

46. The word -  $\text{מִן}$  - is treated as if it were -  $\text{מִן־אֶת}$  - cf. Tanhuma Balak 14; NUM. Rabbah 20,20; Yalk.Shimoni, 768.
47. There is, however, no conclusive evidence that Onkelos derives -  $\text{מִן־אֶת}$  - from -  $\text{אֶת־}$  (companion) as Rashi makes us believe for Onkelos' tendency in inserting  $\text{אֶת־}$  is purely to avoid the anthropomorphism.
48. NUM. Rabbah 20, 20; cf. Tanhuma, Balak 14; Yalk.Shimoni, Balak 768; Ps. Jonathan; the Palest. Targum; Neofiti; Ibn Ezra; Sforino. Onkelos here takes an independent line, followed by Rashi and his grandson, Rabbi Samuel Ben Meir.
49. cf. Tanhuma Balak 14; NUM. Rabbah 20, 20.

50. cf. Ps. Jonathan. Also the Palest. Targum and Neofiti with slight variations. Midrash Aggadah, v.2, p.140 however, follows Onkelos: -  
 . . . ולפי שאין בו לא נחשים ולא קסמים וכו' .  
 לכן הם עם כלביא יקום בתחילה וכארי יתנשא, ולבסוף  
 לא ישכב ולא יכנס לארץ עד שיהרוג הגוים אשר הם עם,  
 ויאכל הערף שלהם שהוא ממנו כמה דתימר ואכלת את  
 כל העמים (רב. ז. טז.) ודם חללים ישתה - שיטחו אותם  
 חללים על פני השדה ולא יחיו שום אחד מהם .

In the light of the Midrash Aggadah this note should be in Group A.

51. cf. A. Sperber, The Bible in Aramaic, p.265; S.D. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger, p. 69; N. Adler, Netinah-Lager; M. Levenstein, Nephesh-Hager; I. Berlin, Mine-Targuma, Balak, p.23.
52. cf. Ps. Jonathan, the Palest. Targum; Neofiti; Zohar, Vilna 1882, Parashat Balak. Nahmanides, however, claims that Rashi's reading in the Targum Onkelos is incorrect, and that it has been taken from the Palestinian Targum: -  
 "ורע" כתב כתרומו, כי היה הרב מתרגם בו ועו למדברא דעזרו  
 ביה בע ישראל עגלא אנפיהי. ואין כן בנוסחאות מוקדקות כתרומו  
 על מונקלוס, אבל הוא כתוב בקצתן שהוא בהן מן התרגום הירושלמי -  
 See Midrash Hagadol, NUM. p.423; Midrash Aggadah, Buber, v.2, p.140. In other editions, however, the reading in Onkelos is as follows -  
 - ועו למדברא אפור -

52. (cont'd).

"And he set his face towards the desert". Whilst scholars are in dispute as to whether Rashi had seen the Jerusalem Targum (see ch. Rashi and Ps. Jonathan's Targum)

Nahmanides had definitely seen it as can be seen from here. cf. also Nahmanides, GEN.30<sup>20</sup>; NUM.11<sup>28</sup>.

53. When the midrashic interpretation of Onkelos or of the Rabbis does no violence to the biblical text Rashi calls it "Peshat" as in this instance. cf. Rashi, GEN.22<sup>14</sup>; NUM.24<sup>7</sup>. See Midrashic Section, Group A, note 7. See also this Group, note 14, footnote 45; Midrashic Section, Group E. (d). Rashi's Occasional Reversion to the Talmudic Concept.

54. cf. Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer, ch.29; Rashi GEN.17<sup>3</sup>; Midrash Aggadah, Buber, v.2, p. 142.

55. Ps. Jonathan, the Palest. Targum and Neofiti take - נפל - in the sense of - נשטתה על אפיו - "fell on his face". cf. Midrash Aggadah, Buber, v.2. pp.141-142:-  
 - נפל - כשהיה רוצה לדבר עמו הקב"ה, היה (בלעס)  
 משתטח לארץ ומפיל עצמו לתרעא וכו'...

NOTESGROUP B

56. Rashi calls Onkelos' midrashic interpretation - פ'רש' - although it is purely midrashic. . See Midrashic Section, Group E.(d) Rashi's Occasional Reversion to the Talmudic Concept. See Raphael Loewe, The Plain Meaning of Scripture in Early Jewish Exegesis, p.176 ff.
57. The Bab.Tal.Ned.81<sup>a</sup> gives a different interpretation. See Midrash Tannaim, DEUT.33, p.213; Midrash Hagadol, NUM.p.428; Rabenu Bachai in his commentary on the Torah.
58. cf. Ps. Jonathan, the Palest. Targum and Neofiti (with slight variations).
59. cf. Ps. Jonathan; the Palest. Targum; Neofiti. Perhaps this is also the meaning of the Midrash, GEN.Rabbah, Parasha 98,7:- כָּרַע שָׁכַב - מִדָּוִד עַד צִיְדִיָּקִי - i.e. from King David to King Zedekiah, the Israelites settled in their land in strength and might. See Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p.842; Midrash Hagadol, NUM.p.428.
60. cf. Siphre, H<sup>2</sup>azinu, Piska 13; Midrash Tannaim, p.192 ff; Lekah-Tov; Bab.Tal.Ket.p.112<sup>a</sup>; Palest.Tal.Peah.ch.7, Halacha 3.

NOTESGROUP B

61. Ps. Jonathan; the Palest. Targum and Neofiti are closer to the "Derash" of the Rabbis.
62. The fact that Rashi had to repeat himself by stating that these two verses can be explained according to Onkelos, when he has stated right at the beginning that "the whole text is to be understood like the Targum", leads to the assertion that one of these statements must be deleted. It appears, however, that there is a misprint and it is preferable to delete the first statement (in v.13) as what follows is nowhere in agreement with the interpretation of Onkelos, but rather with the Siphre. See the Pentateuch with Rashi's commentary, p.232, note 4, where A.M. Silberman quotes Dessauer who believes that the first statement of Rashi in verse 13 - כל המקרא בתרגומן - refers to Ps. Jonathan. A similar idea was put forward by A. Bromberg Sinai, Mossad Harav Kook, Jerusalem, 1966, v. 57, p.91. This is highly unlikely as Rashi follows to the letter the interpretation of the Siphre and not that of Ps. Jonathan. Silberman follows the theory of A. Berliner (see Berliner's Rashi second edition, p.433, and his Beiträge zur Geschichte der Rashi, Commentar, pp.28-29) who holds that Rashi did not see Ps. Jonathan's Targum on the Pentateuch. On this subject, see ch. "Rashi and Ps. Jonathan's Targum". See also Bromberg, who claims that the expression - כל המקרא בתרגומן -

NOTES

GROUP B

62. (cont'd).

does not appear in the Vatican manuscript of Rashi.

63. DEUT. H<sup>2</sup>azinu, Piska 330; cf. also Midrash Tannaim, p.202 f; Lekah-Tov; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. p. 732; Onkelos and Rashi EX.17<sup>16</sup>.

64. See Section, Anthropomorphisms, Group B, References to Human Form and Organs, note 13.

## NOTES

MIDRASH - GROUP C

1. cf. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti. The Palest. Targum translates literally:- וְהוּא אֱדָם נֶפֶשׁ דְּחַיָּה
2. This is also the interpretation of the Rabbis in GEN. Rabbah, Parasha 8,11 that man is like an Angel in the sense of understanding and speech. See Midrash Aggadah, Buber, v.1, p.4; Nahmanides, who explains that Onkelos is in line with Rabbinic interpretation; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p.80; Yalk. Shimoni, 20 - נִשְׁמָה - וְהוּא אֱדָם נֶפֶשׁ דְּחַיָּה - i.e. the understanding and the knowledge, the nature and disposition of man. See Maimonides, Guide to the Perplexed, v.1, ch.1; Rabbi I. Arama - עֲקִידָה, שְׁעַר שִׁיעוּר - B. Berkovitz - חֲלִיבוֹת שְׂמֵלָה - p. 22. All this ascends ultimately to the Aristotelian notion of the tripartite soul; that element therein which is the human prerogative, i.e. the soul (or mind) capable of intelligence (noetikos) was sometimes described in mediaeval Hebrew as נִשְׁמָה הַמְדַבֶּרֶת - and to this the midrashic references to דִּבּוּר - point forward.
3. cf. Neofiti. Ps. Jonathan interprets:- לְבוּשֵׁי דִקְרָמֵן מִשְׁן חַיָּה - "garments of glory from the skin of the serpent". cf. Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer, ch.20; R. David Kimhi on the Torah, p.38; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p.109; J. Bowker, Haggadah in the Targum Onkelos, J.S.S. v.12, p.54.



## NOTES

## GROUP C

4. See GEN. Rabbah, 20; Matenoth Kehunah in the name of Maimonides who interprets that before Adam had sinned, his garments were made of - אור - but after his transgression, they became - עור; Midrash Tanhuma, Buber, pp. 17-18 - מהו כותנות עור- ריש לקיש אמר כמעשי רישימית - cf. Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer, ch. 14 מה היה לבושו של אדם הראשון עור של צפורן וענן כבוד מכוסה עליו כיון שאכל מפרות האילן נפשו עור צפורן מעליו ונאה עצמו ערוה ונסתלק ענן כבוד מעליו - See Yalk. Shimoni, Bereshit, 34, p. 19; M. Guttman, Enc. Jud. 1, 765; L. Ginzberg, Legends, v. 5, p. 97, No. 69; idim, Die Haggada bei den Kirchenvätern, Berlin 1900, p. 49, quoted J. Komlosch, p. 171, note 8; A. Berliner, Targum Onkelos, 1884, p. 128.
5. See the argument between Rab. and Shemuel; N. Adler, Netinah-Lager; S. B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos; M. Levenstein, Nefesh Hager.
6. - כותנת עור- יש דברי אגדה אומרים מלקים בצפורן היו מדביקים על עורן. ויש אומרים - דבר הבא מן הער כגון צמר הארנבים וכו' - Perhaps Rashi avoided quoting Rabbi Meir's version in order not to confuse the student of the Torah in thinking that the Torah as we have it, contains different versions.
7. - דרש רבי פפוס הן האדם היה כאחד ממנו - כאחד מקלמי הערבה - 21, 5:

See M. D. Cassuto - מאדם עד נח - p. 115. See also Section, Anthropomorphisms, Group 1, References Exposed to Polytheistic Interpretation, note 1. See Moshe Zucker - Pentateuchal Exegeses of Saadia Gaon and Samuel Ben Chofni Incorporated into the Midrash Hagadol (Abraham Weiss, Jubilee Volume), p. 463 ff.

## NOTES

GROUP C

8. cf. Mechilta, Rabbi Ishmael, Beshalach, Massechta 2, Parasha 6; Mechilta Rabbi Shimon 14, 29; Yalk.Shimoni, Bereshit, ch.34, p.20.
9. See Maimonides, Guide to the Perplexed, v.1. ch.2; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p.109; J. Komlosh, p.171; N. Adler, Netinah-Lager; S.B. Schefftel, Biure-Onkelos, p.8. M. Levenstein, Nefesh-Hager, v.1, p.37; G. Vermes, Haggadah in the Onkelos Targum, J.S.S. v.8, pp. 164-165.
10. See ch. Rashi and Pseudo Jonathan, note 1.
11. cf. S.D. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger, p. 18 - והשכיל אונקלוס לנשורד - מפשט הכתוב, והפריד מלת כאחד הסמוכה ופירשה וחילאי בעלמא, והדבק מלת ממנו למלות לדעת טוב ורע וכו' --  
cf. also Maimonides in - ch.8 - שמנר פיר קייב -  
- הן האדם - וכבר ביאר התרגום בפירושו שהרשע  
בו ממנו לרעת טוב ורע ר"ל שהוא היה אחד בקולם ר"ל מין שאין כמורו  
מן אחר שישתף עמו בזה הענין אשר נמצא בו ובוא שממנו ומעצמו ידע  
הטוב והרע ויעשה איזה מהן שירצה וכו'...

The Palestinian Targumim, in this respect, not only exclude the possibility of any polytheistic implication in - ממנו - but also convey the idea of autonomy and freewill of man in choosing between good and evil.

See Ephraim E. Urbach, The Sages, their Concepts and Beliefs, pp.283-284, who quotes Onkelos' Targum; M.D.

Cassuto - מאמר על נח - Jerusalem, 1953, p.73; S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, op. cit. p.8.

GROUP C

12. On the words - צִוּקִים - and - קוֹל - See M.D. Cassuto, v.1, p.27. Grammatically speaking the phrase - דְּמֵי כִּי - is because of the Semantic progression "spots of blood", "bloodstains". cf. - דְּמֵי כִּי - in EX.22<sup>1</sup>.
13. cf. also the Palest. Targum and Neofiti. Ps. Jonathan however, translates literally.
14. See GEN. Rabbah, 22,9: - רַבִּי יוֹנָן אוֹמֵר דֵּם אַחֲרָא אִין כְּתִיב כֹּהֵן - אַלֵּא דְּמֵי אַחֲרָא דְּמֹו וְדֵם זֶרַע עִוְרֵי דִּין.  
cf. Yalk. Shimon, Bereshit, 38, p.21; Mishna Sanh. 4,5.  
Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p.119; Abot de Rabbi Nathan - נְוֹסֶחָא - ch.31.
15. Onkelos: - וַיֹּאמֶר לִמָּן לְנִשְׁוֹהִי עֹדָה וְצֹלָה שְׂמֵעָן קוֹלִי נִשְׁוִי לִמָּן אֲצִירָהּ - לְמִימָרָה לֹא גִבְרָא קְעֻלִּית דְּבִדְלָה אֲנָא סְבִיל חֻבִּין וְאִף לֹא עוֹלִימָא - חֲבִלִית דְּבִדְלָה יִשְׁתַּצִּי זֶרַעִי.  
It is also possible that the Targum is to be read as a question expecting the answer "yes". (Is it not the case that I have killed a man etc.)
16. cf. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti.
17. cf. Tanhuma, Bereshit, 11; Midrash Aggadah, v.1. p.13; GEN. Rabbah, 23, 4.

18. Perhaps Rashi, in this instance, quotes only the Midrash because it has greater clarity than Onkelos.
19. See Tanhuma, Bereshit, 11; Midrash Hagadol, p.127; Midrash Aggadah, v.1, p.13.
20. Rashi: - כי שבעתי יקם קין - קין שהרג מויד נתלה לו עץ שבעה זרות  
אע שהרגתי שגג לא כל עכן שיתלה לי שבעיות הרבה.
21. Onkelos: - ארי לשבעה דרין איתלן לקין הלא ללמך בריה  
שבעין ושבעה.
- cf. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti. The Targumim take the textual word - יקם - not in the sense of "revenge" (נקם) (cf. EX.21<sup>20-21</sup>) - but in the sense of - made to stand (קום) in suspense - יתלן - postponing the punishment. cf. GEN. Rabbah, 23,4; Yalk. Shimoni, Bereshit 38. See N. Adler, Netinah-Lager.
22. This is the N.E.B. translation, but in some texts the English reads - "Then it was begun to call idols by the name of the Eternal". This translation corresponds to GEN. Rabbah, 23,7, quoted by Rashi: - לקרוא את שמות האדם  
ואת שמות העצבים בשמן של דקב"ה  
cf. Yalk. Shimoni 39; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p.128.

699  
NOTES  
GROUP C

23. cf. Ps. Jonathan:- וְעָבַדְוּ לְמַטְעֵי שְׂרִיאוֹ דְּמִיּוּמָהּ -  
לְכִן מַעֲוֹן וּמִכְנָן לְמַעֲוִתִּיהוֹן בְּעוֹד מִימְרָא דְּרַחֲמֵי  
 cf. also Neofiti. See S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos,  
 p.13. His argument that Onkelos differs from Ps.  
 Jonathan is not convincing.
24. In most texts this is the version in Onkelos; however,  
 some read - לְצַלְמָהּ - and not - מִלְצַלְמָהּ -  
 See A. Sperber. According to this version - הוֹחֵל - is  
 from - חֵלֵל (חֵלֵל) - to begin. cf. Ibn Ezra: See J.  
 Bowker, The Targum and Rabbinic Literature, p.141; Ps.  
 Philo II. 8. (Appendix I). However, - לְצַלְמָהּ - seems the  
 better reading, since it is difficult to assign a  
 negative meaning to - חֵלֵל - whatever the root to which  
 it is assigned. If the negative meaning "acted profanely"  
 is postulated, this would demand a Pael form - חֵלְלָהּ.
25. cf. GEN. Rabbah 25, 1:- אָמַר רַבִּי אִיבּוֹ חֲטָךְ חֲטָף הִיָּה, פְּעָמִים -  
צָדִיק וּפְעָמִים רָשָׁע אָמַר הַקֶּבֶ"ה עַד שֶׁהוּא בְּצָדִיקוֹ  
אִסְתַּלְּקָנוּ  
 cf. Yalk. Shimoni, 42.
26. While the above cited Midrash (see the above note) takes  
 Enoch as a "wicked man". Ps. Jonathan Targum believes  
 that he went up to heaven and became "Metatron" the great

26. (cont'd).

scribe: - ארוב אתנגיד וסליק לרקיעא . . . וקרא שמייה מיטטרון -  
ספרא רבא . . .

cf. Tosafoth ( - ד"ה פסוק ) Bab. Tal. Hul. p.60,  
that Enoch is "Metatron", "prince of the world"; see  
Ecclus. 44<sup>16</sup>; Wisdom 4<sup>10</sup> - where Enoch is highly praised;  
also Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p.132 - ואיננו יתאנא עלשה -  
עלו ושימיו במרום ואילו הן חנוך ומשה ואליהו .  
cf. Midrash Aggadah, v.1, p.15; Sepher Enoch; Beth  
Hamidrash, v.5, p.171; LXX holds that Enoch was trans-  
lated. On this subject, see E.E. Urbach, Enc. Haivrit,  
v.17, pp. 694-695; J. Bowker, op. cit. p.143-150.

27. Perhaps Onkelos deliberately interpreted that Enoch died  
an unnatural death, although the verse could be inter-  
preted otherwise, in order to exclude any support for the  
Christian contention that Jesus also did not die. The  
fact that the Rabbis (GEN. Rabbah 25) depreciated Enoch  
and called him a "wicked man", supports this theory. It  
appears that the Rabbis were confronted by the Christians  
to explain the difficulty of this verse which gives rise  
to the Christian's contention - see GEN. Rabbah, ibid -

- מפרונה שאלה את רבי יוסי, אמרה לו אין אנו  
מוצאים מידה בחנוך . . .

27. (cont'd). - אפיקורסים שאלו לרבי אבהו, אמרו לו אין אנו  
מוצאים מיתה לחנוך אמר להם למה? אמרו לו  
נאמרה כאן לקיחה ונאמרה להלן (מל' ב.)  
כי היום יהי לוקח את אדונך  
מקל - אשר - - -

See A. Geiger, Hamikra-Ve-Targumav, pp. 126-127:-

- ואולם עלייתו של חנוך השמימה רצה היתה בצע  
היהודים שלאחר ספירת הנוצרים; ולפיכך פרשו את  
הכתובים בדרך אחרת ומיעטו את ערכו הנעלה  
של חנוך. אמנם איש צדיק היה אומר בראשית  
רבה לאותו פסוק, ואעפ"י בן היה נתון בסכנה  
לשקוע בכפירה וכדי למונעו מזה סילקו אלהים  
קודם זמנו. ואונקלוס מבין הרגעה יתירה כשהוא נוטה  
מדיבר הכתוב ארי אמית יתירה יהי' וכו' - - -

See Ginsberg, Legends, v.5, p.156, note 58.

28. This version is mentioned by Rabbenu Bachya, p.96;  
cf. Oheb-Ger., p.30; A. Geiger, Hamikra-Ve-Targumav,  
p.127, who believes that this is a late version.  
However, the Tosafoth Bab.Tal.Yeb.16<sup>b</sup> reads in Onkelos:-

- "כדמתרגמינן כי לקח אותו - המית יתירה.

See J. Komlosch, op.cit. p.167; A. Sperber quotes the  
two versions, p.8. The other Palest. Targumim, Ps.  
Jonathan, the Palest. Targum and Neofiti do not mention  
"death" in connection with Enoch.

NOTESGROUP C

29. Perhaps in cases where there is doubt about Onkelos' rendering, as in this instance, Rashi prefers not to quote him. This perhaps would explain also the reason for not quoting him in GEN.4<sup>26</sup>.
30. cf. Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p.135: - נִתֵּן לָהֶם אֲרֻכָּא מֵאָה וְעֶשְׂרִים שָׁנָה כְּנֹגֵד שְׁנוּתֵינוּ עַל מַעֲשֵׂה שָׂמָא יַעֲשׂוּ רַעְיוֹנֵיהֶּם וְלֹא יַעֲשׂוּ.  
cf. Midrash Tannaim, D. Hoffmann, DEUT.34<sup>7</sup>; Mechilta, Beshalach Parasha 5; J. Komlosh, op.cit. p.173. L. Ginsberg, Legends, v.174; Nahmanides and Rabbenu Bachya N. Adler, Netinah-Lager; Ber. Rabbah 26, 6; Bab.Tal.Sanh. 108<sup>a</sup>; Tanh. Bereshit, p. 26.
31. Onkelos: - וְאָמַר... לֹא יִתְקִיִּים דְּרַמ בִּישָׁא הִרִין... אֲרֻכָּא יְהִיבַת לָהֶון מֵאָה וְעֶשְׂרִים שָׁנָן אִם יִתְּבוּן.  
And the Lord said, this evil generation shall not stand before me for ever, etc. An extension will I give them and 120 years if they repent. cf. Ps. Jonathan; the Palest. Targum; Neofiti.
32. cf. Ps. Jonathan; the Palest. Targum and Neofiti.
33. See Section, Veneration, Group A, note 13.



34. cf. Bab. Tal.Sanh.99<sup>b</sup>; Abod. Zara. 9<sup>a</sup>, and Rashi who quotes Onkelos; GEN. Rabbah, 39, 14: - ואת הנפש-אמר רב הונא אברהם היה מג"ר את הנשיות ושרה מג"ר את הנשים.  
cf. Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p. 220; Yalk.Shimoni, 66.p.36. Aboth de Rabbi Nathan, S. Schechter. (נוסחה א'), ch.12, p. 27.
35. - אמר רב יהודה רעים בגופן וחטאים במקומן -
36. Sanh. 109<sup>a</sup>.
37. cf. Ps. Jonathan - בשין בממוניהן דין לדן ומי"בין בגופן בגילוי עריותא ושדיות אדם וכו'...  
Neofiti reads: - בשין גבר לחבריה ומי"בין בגילוי עריותא ובשפיכות...  
- רעים - אלו לאלו, חטאים בגילוי עריות - cf. GEN. Rabbah 41,7: - ר' - בעבודת כוכבים, מאד בשפיכות דמים.  
They were "wicked" to each other; "sinners" in in chastity; "against the Lord" - in idolatry; "exceedingly" refers to bloodshed. In Sanh.109<sup>a</sup> the word against - "the Lord" - refers to - ברכה ר' - blasphemy; cf. Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p.230; See Aboth de Rabbi Nathan, op.cit. (נוסחה א'), ch.12, p. 52 - where the same interpretation occurs with slight variations.

38. See Bab.Tal.Kid.32<sup>b</sup> - מעשה ברבי אליעזר ורבי יהושע ורבי צדוק שהיו מסובין בבית המשתה בנו של רבן גמליאל ויהי רבן גמליאל עומד ומשקה עליהם.. אמר לו רבי אליעזר מה זה יהושע מנו יושבים ורבן גמ' עומד ומשקה עלינו אמר ליה מצטנו גדול ממנו עשימש, אברהם גדול הדור היה וכתוב בו והוא עומד עליהם - - -  
cf. Siphre, Ekev, Piska 38; Yalk. Shimoni, Beshalach, 229; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p. 296.
39. cf. Ps. Jonathan - See GEN.18<sup>22</sup> - ואברהם - where Onkelos interprets - ואברהם עומד ער כען משמש בצלן.  
See also GEN.19<sup>27</sup> - וישב אברהם בבקר אל המקום אשר עמד שם. - ואקדם אברהם בצפרה לאתרא דשמש תמן בצלל וכו'...  
cf. Ps. Jonathan. Neofiti, however, translates literally - See Section, Veneration, Group A, note 12. - ואברהם הוא קיים עליהן.
40. Rashi: - אלי עשו - וכן עומדים במקום כלה את עושה בהם ואם לא יעמדו במקום ארעה מה מעשה להפרץ מן ביסורין ולא אכלה אורכן.
41. This is the version in most books of the Targum. However, Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. p. 35 and A. Sperber, quote a different version in Onkelos: - הכי קבליתיהון דעלת לקדמי עבדו - מעבד עמון גמירא אמר רבי"בין ואם - - - אדפרע.
- Luzzatto has already remarked that the difficulty in

## 41. (cont'd)

this version is obvious, for it implies that God will exterminate them, even though they repent. However, Luzzatto quotes some commentators who take the word -  $\text{לְרַחֵם}$  - not in the sense of extermination, but rather in the sense of "forgiveness". This translation is far fetched. On this word see I. Levy's dictionary, v.1. p. 146. On the difficulty of this version, see also N. Adler, Netinah-Lager; S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos; Ibn Ezra and Nahmanides.

42. cf. Yalk. Shimon 83; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p.312; Mechilta, Beshalach, Massechta Deshirata, Parasha 5; Tanhuma, Beshalach, p. 89, 15; Midrash Aggadah, v.1. p. 42; Ps. Jonathan; the Palest. Targum; Neofiti.
43. The Pentateuch with Rashi's Commentary. N.E.B. translate: "One evening when he had gone out into the open country hoping to meet them (or to relieve himself) he looked up and saw camels approaching. (Incidentally to translate -  $\text{לְרַחֵם}$  - "to relieve himself" is certainly odd).
44. cf. GEN. Rabbah, 60, 14; Midrash Hagadol, GEN, op.cit. p. 410; ibid. p. 323; Bab. Tal. Ber. 26<sup>b</sup>; Palest. Tal. Ber. ch.4, Halacha 1; Palest. Tal. Pes. ch.5. Halacha 1; Tanhuma, Chaye-Sarah, p. 33, ch.5; Tanhuma, ibid, p.51, ch.9; NUM. Rabbah, Parasha 2,1. See also Section, Veneration, Group A, note 14.

45. See GEN. Rabbah 60;16;Yalk. Shimoni 109; Lekah-Tov; Midrash Aggadah, v.1, p. 60; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p.412; Section, Veneration, Group A, note 11.
46. cf. Ps. Jonathan. Neofiti translates literally. See also Nahmanides, who quotes Onkelos; M. Levenstein, Nefesh Hager, p.82. It is true that Onkelos represents the less developed and less circumstantial stage of the Derash quoted by Rashi, nonetheless, it appears that Onkelos had this Derash in mind.
47. J.W. Etheridge, The Targums, London 1862, translates Onkelos as follows: "And Jacob was a man of peace, a minister of the house of instruction". This is incorrect for - עָלִים - is not from - עָלָם - peace, but from - עָלָם - complete, perfect. (נָתַם - unimpaired), i.e. of unimpaired integrity, but in Rabbinic Hebrew, it means simple, unintellectual).
48. See GEN. Rabbah 63, 10; Yalk. Shimoni 110; - וַיִּקְרָב אִישׁ תָּם יוֹשֵׁב אֶהְלִים שֶׁנֶּאֱהָלִים בֵּית מִדְּרָשׁוֹ שֶׁל שָׂם. של ענין.  
Midrash Hagadol, GEN.p.441, adds also the school of Abraham.

707  
NOTES  
GROUP C

49. cf. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti.
50. See G. Vermes, J.S.S. v.8, p. 167. See also, Veneration and Idealization of the Patriarchs and their Wives, Group A, note 5.
51. Perhaps Rashi relies on the reader of his commentary to read Onkelos' Targum from which it is clear that by "tents", schools are meant. Rashi, therefore, merely adds that these "tents" are of Shem and Eber who knew the Torah before it was given. Whenever Onkelos' interpretation is inadequate, Rashi augments Onkelos' interpretation. cf. Rashi, GEN.37<sup>3</sup>. See our Midrashic Section, Group D, note 1, footnote 2. It may even be said that the commentaries of Rashi and Onkelos are almost inseparable and the student is advised to read them in conjunction in order to fully comprehend the biblical text.
52. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti translate literally.
53. cf. GEN. Rabbah 64, 10; Yalk. Shimoni 111; Midrash Hagadol - GEN. p. 456:- בקשו ממנו שיצמד בגרית אברהם אבינו  
cf. Pirke Rabbi Eliezer, ch. 36.

NOTESGROUP C

54. The root - ריד - or - רוד - is generally assumed to mean to be restless and is thought to be connected with the Arabic - رآك
55. cf. GEN. Rabbah 67,7 :- אמר רבי יוסי בר חלפתא אם ראית אחיך - פורק עולה של תורה מעליו גזור עליו שמדים ואיתה שולג בו -  
cf. Yalk.Shimoni 115; Midrash Hagadol, GEN.pp. 484-495; Lekah-Tov; Bab.Tal.Shab. 89<sup>b</sup>.  
Rashi:- תריד- לשון צער כמו חריד בשימי בלומר כשיעברו ישראל על התורה ויהיה לך פתחון פה להצטער על הברכות שנעל ופרקת..
56. Ps. Jonathan, the Palest. Targum and Neofiti follow Onkelos.  
The word - ניר - in the Targum means yoke, servitude.  
cf. Bab.Tal. Shab. p. 54<sup>b</sup>:-  
אמר רב הונא בר ניר א וכו'...  
Rashi interprets as follows:- בר ניר- עול קטן שמניחין לעגל בצמרו שיהיה למור לכופ ראשו לכשיגדל -  
See too, M. Jastrow, v.2.p.909.
57. See GEN. Rabbah, 84,14; Yalk.Shimoni 141; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. op.cit. p. 634; Tanhuma (Buber) Vayeshev, 13. See also M. Levenstein, Nefesh Hager; S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos. Ps. Jonathan reads:- ונחני מר -  
cf.Neofiti.See Midrashic Section, Group E(e) Rashi and Derash, note 5.

709  
NOTES  
GROUP C

58. Perhaps as Onkelos' interpretation is ambiguous, Rashi prefers to quote the Midrash and at the same time, through the Midrash, Rashi hopes that Onkelos' Targum will also be clearer. It may even be said that, on the whole, so long as Rashi does not say Onkelos translated the text in a different manner, we may assume that Rashi believes that Onkelos' text can be interpreted in the light of the same Derash quoted by him.
59. See Bab.Tal.Sot. 36<sup>b</sup>; GEN. Rabbah 87,7; (but the argument is not between Rab and Shemuel). Yalk. Shimoni, 146; Mechilta, Rabbi Shimon Ben Yohai, EX.35<sup>2</sup>; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p. 668.
60. cf. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti.
61. One might expect Rashi to say that Onkelos translates the text according to the opinion of Rab. cf. Rashi EX.25<sup>29</sup>; DEUT.32<sup>26</sup>. See Halachic Section, Group F.
62. See, too, Raphael Loewe, The Plain Meaning Of Scripture In Early Jewish Exegesis, p. 172.

NOTESGROUP C

63. Perhaps the Targumim follow Rab's opinion, out of respect to Joseph. See Luzzatto Oheb.Ger. p. 20. See also, Veneration and Idealization of the Patriarch's Sons, Group B, note 4.
64. cf. GEN. Rabbah 90,4: - צפנת פנח - אמר רבי יוחנן צפנות - מופיע ונחזות לו לאמר רבי חזקיה אמר צפנות מופיע ברצת מנח רוחן של בריות בהן.  
 Rabbi Johanan said: The name connotes: He reveals things that are hidden and finds it easy to declare them. Rabbi Hezekiah says: With his knowledge he reveals things that are hidden and sets the minds of people at ease. cf. Yalk. Shimoni 148; Midrash Sechel Tov, p. 257. Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p.714.
65. cf. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti. See Samuel Ben Meir and Ibn Ezra, who believe that Zaphenath-paneah is an Egyptian name; The Vulgate translates "Salvatorem Mundi". The "Saviour of the World". See Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews (translated by William Whiston, London, George Routledge and Sons) Book II.ch.6. "The king called him Psothom Phanech, out of regard to his prodigious degree of wisdom; for that name denotes the revealer of secrets". According to Mahlev, (Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenl<sup>a</sup>dischen Gesellschaft,



65. (cont'd).

61, 1907, p.625 ff). "Zaphenath" means - "he who feeds the world"- and "Paneah" - is "he who gives life" - quoted by J. Komlosh, p. 175. The latest modern commentary (E.A. Speiser, Anchor Bible, GEN. 1962, pp. 311-314) endorses the view that the name means, in Egyptian, "God speaks: he lives". cf. B.D.B. p. 861, and Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 140, 1955, p. 31; J. Vergote, Joseph en Egypte, 1959, pp. 141 ff.

66. cf. GEN. Rabbah, 93,10; LEV. Rabbah, 32,5; Yalk. Shimoni 152; Mechilta Bo, Parasha 5:-  
 - ומנין שלא שינו את לשונך  
 שנאמר כי פי המדבר אליכם -  
 cf. Tanhuma, Vayigash, 5; ibid. Balak, 16; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p. 765 and footnote 5.

67. cf. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti; Ibn Ezra; Samuel Ben Meir; David Kamhi, p. 197. Nahmanides believes that the commentators followed Onkelos' Targum. In Bab.Tal. Meg. p. 16<sup>b</sup> we read the following:-  
 - אמר רבי בעמין  
 בר יפת אמר רבי מלך ב פי כפי בן לבי .

68. The Rabbis tell us that the Divine Presence departed from Jacob, because it does not rest upon men in

68. (cont'd).

times of sorrow. cf. Bab.Tal.Shab.30<sup>b</sup>; Pes.117<sup>a</sup>;  
Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p. 766; Tanhuma, Vayeshev, ch.2.  
p. 45: - וַתְּחִי רוּחַ יַעֲקֹב - וְכִי מָתָה הִיטָה אֵלָּא עֲמִיתָה מִן הַחֶרֶד -  
וַשְּׂרֵתָה בּוֹ רוּחַ הַקֹּדֶשׁ עֲנִסְתָּ לָקָה הַיָּמָנוּ -

cf. Pirke Rabbi Eliezer, ch.38 - who quotes Tanhuma  
and Onkelos: Aboth de Rabbi Nathan, ch.20. (נְוִסְתָּה' א');  
Rabbi David Kimhi on the Torah. See also II Kings,  
ch.3, v. 15., (about Elisha the prophet). See Rabbi  
Samuel Ben Nissim, Bereshith Zuta, p. 304.

69. cf. Ps. Jonathan. Neofiti, however, translates:-

- וַתְּחִי רוּחִיהָ דִּיעֲקֹב אֲבוּרְהוֹן -

70. cf. Bab. Tal. Baba Bathra 123<sup>a</sup> - אֵלָּא חִיבִי - וּרְדִפְלָהּ -  
קָעִתִּי - וְזוֹ בִקְעָה -

cf. Yalk. Shimoni 157; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. pp.831-832.  
The Midrashim and Onkelos' Targum take - בִּקְעָרִי - as  
if it were - בִּבְקָרִי . In GEN. Rabbah 96,6 -  
בַּמִּצְוֹת וּבַמַּעֲשִׂים - is taken to mean - בַּחֲרָבִי וּבִקְעָרִי  
- "with the practice of Mitzvoth and  
good deeds". cf. the Palest. Targum and Neofiti.

71. See Veneration and Idealization of the Patriarchs and their Wives, Group A, note 15.
72. Whilst the Palest. Targum and Neofiti interpret similarly to Onkelos:-  
 לא במרבי ולא בקטני אלהן.  
 בזכותי ובקבלי מביא -  
 Ps. Jonathan translates literally - בקטני -  
 It shows that the theory that Onkelos is a short version of Ps. Jonathan is open to question. See Introduction to Midrashic Section; Group A, note 1, footnote 4.  
 (Sperber's text of Onkelos - במרבי ובקטני -)
73. See GEN. Rabbah, 98,4:-  
 יותר שאת ויתר ען - הבכורה היתה שלך  
 והכהונה היתה שלך והמלכות היתה שלך ועכשיו שחטאת נתנה  
 - הבכורה ליוסף והכהונה ללוי, והמלכות ליהודה.  
 You should have received three portions in excess of your brothers: the birthright, priesthood, and royalty. But when you did sin, the birthright was transferred to Joseph, priesthood to Levi, and royalty to Judah. cf. Tanh. Vayehi 9; Tanh. Buber, Vayehi, 11; GEN. Rabbah, Shitah Chadasha, Parasha 2; Yalk. Shimoni 247, 157; Bab. Tal. Yeb. 76<sup>a</sup>; Baba Bathra, p. 123<sup>a</sup>; Midrash Aggadah, Buber, Vayehi, v.1, pp. 108-109. Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p. 836.

74. The same interpretation is given by Ps. Jonathan, the Palest. Targum and Neofiti and only the following is added: -  
 וְעַל דִּמְטִית בְּרִי אֲתִיהֶבִית בְּכִירוֹתָא לְיוֹסֵף וּמַלְכוּתָא -  
 לְיְהוּדָה וּבְהוֹנֵתָא לְלֵוִי -

See GEN. 35<sup>22</sup> where Reuben's sin is mentioned. See Rabbi David Kimhi, p. 204 and Rabbi Bachya, v.1, p.379, who takes Onkelos' interpretation as the <sup>P</sup>eshat of the text.

75. See I. Chron. ch.5, l. See, however, Bab.Tal.Shab.p.55<sup>b</sup> and Rashi. cf. GEN. Rabbah 98,4, where Rabbi Simon Ben Yohai believes that Reuben did not sin but he simply vindicated his mother's humiliation: ...אֵלָּא עֲלֵבּוֹן אִמּוֹ  
 תִּבְעַץ שָׁכַל יָמֶיהָ שֶׁהִיְתָה רַחֵל קִיּוּמָת הִיְתָה מִטְּתָה נִתּוּנָה אֶצֶל מִטְּט  
 שֶׁל יַעֲקֹב אֲבִינוּ כִּיּוֹן שָׁמְתָה רַחֵל נִטְלָה יַעֲקֹב אֲבִינוּ מִטְּתָה שֶׁל בִּלְהָה  
 וְנִתְּנָה אֶצֶל מִטְּטוֹ. אָמַר (רַאשׁוֹן) לֹא רִי לְאַתְקִנָּה בְּחַיִּי אֲחוֹתָה אֵלָּא  
 אַף לְאַחַר מוֹתָהּ, עָלָה וּקְלָקְלָה אֶת הַיְצוּעִין.

The truth, however, is that he vindicated his mother's humiliation. For as long as Rachel lived, her bed stood near that of the Patriarch Jacob: when Rachel died, Jacob took Bilhah's bed and placed it at the side of his. Reuben said, was it not enough for my mother to be the victim of jealousy during her sister's lifetime, but must she also be so after her death? Thereupon he went up and disarranged the beds, (i.e. putting Leah's bed in the place of Bilhah's.

GROUP C

75. (cont'd)

This alone was his sin). cf. Ps. Jonathan, GEN.35<sup>22</sup>;  
Rashi GEN.35<sup>22</sup>.

76. See M. Adler, Netinah-Lager, who translates - אַפֿ -  
in the sense of "anger." M. Levenstein, Nephesh-Hager,  
p. 157 follows Adler. This is incorrect for one would  
expect Onkelos to say - בַּתֵּר אַפֿ - and not - לִקְבֹּל אַפֿ -  
See S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, p. 71, who argues  
with Adler and takes it in the sense of - לִקְרֹאת מַחֲשַׁבְתְּךָ -  
towards your own thoughts; in other words, pleasing  
himself.

77. Neofiti makes the idea of repentance even clearer -

רַחֲמֵי בְרִי וְעַל דַּחְשִׁית תַּשְׁתַּרִּי וְיִשְׁתַּבֵּק לִךְ.

Onkelos, therefore, must be understood in the light  
of the Palest. Targumim. Onkelos does not connect the  
word - עֹלָה - with the sentence that precedes it, as  
Rashi does - אֵל מִלֵּלַת יִצְחָק עֹלָה - but rather by  
itself and it means my son, through your repentance,  
God had accepted you, (lit. he has risen [ back into  
God's favour ] ).

78. See S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, op.cit. p.72;  
Nephesh-Hager, op.cit.,v.1, p.158;Torah Shelemah,  
v.7, p. 1785.

NOTESGROUP C

79. See Bab.Tal.Meg.3<sup>a</sup>.
80. Both teachers believe that Reuben sinned and in GEN. Rabbah, 98,4, Rabbi Eliezer translates the word פ'ח'ץ - in the following way:- פח'ץ, חטאת ונר - "thou didst hasten, thou hast sinned, thou didst commit adultery". Rabbi Joshua explains:- פ'ח'ץ קול, חללית יצועי, וע יצרך ערליך - thou didst throw off the yoke, thou didst defile my bed, thy passion did stir within thee. cf. Bab. Tal.Shab.55<sup>a</sup>; Tanhuma Buber, Vayehi, p.218; Tanh.9; Midrash Chadash, p.202; Aboth de Rabbi Nathan, (נוסחה ב'), ch.44; Midrash Aggadah, Vayehi, v.1, p. 109; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. op. cit. p.837; Shitah Chadashah, Parasha 2. Onkelos in GEN.35<sup>22</sup> follows his teachers and takes - וישכב - "He slept" literally - וישכב עם בלדה - .
81. See the commentaries - מתנות כהונה ופירוש מדרשן -
82. See GEN. ch.38.
83. The Palest. Targum does not mention the story of Tamar, but it also mentions that after the name of Judah shall all the Jews be called. cf. Neofiti; GEN. Rabbah,98,6; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. op.cit. p.841;

717  
NOTES  
GROUP C

83. (cont'd).

Midrash Chadash, p.203; Yalk. Shimoni, Vayehi, 159;  
M.D. Gross, Ozar Ha<sup>2</sup>ggadah, v.1, p. 447.

84. GEN. Rabbah, 99, 8; cf. Tanh. Vayehi 10; Tanh. Buber, 12, p. 209.

85. On the word - קדל - see M. Jastrow, v.2, p. 1316.

86. Netinah-Lager. In several instances, Onkelos gives two or three interpretations in one text. Rashi was fully aware of this method, cf. Rashi GEN.49<sup>11</sup>. See Midrashic Section, Group A, note 10, infra 39. In other versions of Onkelos, however, the reading is - יתברון - broken - instead of - יתברון - dispersed. See Oheb-Ger. op. cit.p, 46.

87. See GEN. Rabbah 98,6 and 99,8. Rashi explains:-

- ידן בערף - בימי דוד ואיבי נתת לי ערף (ע"ב כב).

88. According to the Bab.Tal.She .16<sup>b</sup> - העתה חיה - ופיעוש -  
וירדו כל עבדיך אלה - cf. also EX.11<sup>8</sup> - ידי ורגלי  
אלי והעתה חו ל.

"And all these thy servants shall come down unto me and prostrate themselves unto me". Onkelos, once

718  
NOTES  
GROUP C

88. (cont'd).

again, does not translate - והשתחוו - literally, but rather - ויבקש ממני - and request of me. See S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, op.cit. p.73; N. Adler, Netinah-Lager. Rashi, on the other hand, does not seem to be concerned with the sensitivity of Onkelos, for he does not comment on this particular word - השתחווה - either in GEN.49<sup>8</sup> nor in EX.11<sup>8</sup>.

89. cf. Ps. Jonathan, the Palest. Targum and Neofiti.

90. cf. GEN. Rabbah 98,7 - בנ עליה - מטרו של יוסף עליה ונה עליה - מטרה של תמר עליה ונה עליה

Thou (Judah) didst go up from the tearing of Joseph and wast thereby exalted; thou didst go up from the destruction of Tamar and wast thereby exalted. cf. ibid, 99,8; Yalk. Shimoni 106; Midrash Chadash, p.203; Tanhuma, Vayehi, 10; Midrash Hagadol, GEN.p.842; L. Ginsberg, Legends, v.5, p.329, note 46 and p.335, note 90.

91. cf. the Palest. Targum and Neofiti.

92. See Our Introduction to the Midrashic Section.



93. cf. the Palest.Targum and Neofiti: Ps. Jonathan translates - נַעֲמָה - literally and - מְנוּחָה - rest - in the world to come. As for the rest of the text Ps. Jonathan is in line with the Midrash that it speaks about the acceptance of Torah and its obligation by Isaachar. Onkelos' rendering of - מְנוּחָה - by - מוֹלָקָא - may have been influenced by the phrase - כִּי לֹא בָחַרְתָּ -  
 עַר עֲתָה אֵל הַמְנוּחָה וְאֵל הַנַּחֲלָה -
94. Other Rabbis believe that the text speaks about the acceptance of Torah and its obligations by Isaachar. cf. GEN. Rabbah 72, 5; *ibid*, 99, 10; Bab.Tal.Ber.p.5<sup>a</sup>; Midrash Aggadah, v.2, p. 112; Lekah-Tov; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. op. cit. p. 848; Ps. Jonathan; L. Ginzberg, Legends, v.5, p. 368. See also Midrashic Section, Group B, note 7.
95. The Pentateuch with Rashi's commentary. N.E.B. however, translates as follows: "Dan - how insignificant his people, <sup>w</sup>lovely as any tribe in Israel". (This translation is odd and not in line with the wording of the text).
96. cf. GEN. Rabbah 98, 13 and 14; *ibid*, 99, 11; Midrash Aggadah, v.1, p. 112; Lekah-Tov, p.237. Sechel Tov, p. 316; Tanhuma, Vayehi 12; Bab.Tal.Sot.p.10<sup>a</sup>; NUM. Rabbah, 10,5; *ibid*.14,9; LEV. Rabbah 8,2; Yalk.Shimoni,

96. (cont'd).  
Shofetim, 247,69; Palest.Tal.Sot.ch.1, Halacha 8.  
Midrash Hagadol, GEN. op.cit. p.849.
97. cf. GEN. Rabbah, 98, 15; Yalk.Shimoni 161; Lekah-Tov,  
p. 238; Sechel Tov, p.317.
98. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti follow Onkelos. The Palest.  
Targum has this to say:- וביתר בן יחורון בשלם למשכניהן -  
"And afterwards they shall return to their dwellings in  
peace". See Nahmanides and Ibn Ezra.
99. The Pentateuch with Rashi's commentary.
100. cf. Ps. Jonathan:- שובו לאשר מן עמינין הינון פירו ארעא -  
מרבית בושמין ועקר' סמטן -  
cf. Palest. Targum and Neofiti.
101. cf. GEN. Rabbah, 98,16; Midrash Tannaim, p.220;  
Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p. 852; Midrash Aggadah, v.1,  
p. 113.
102. However, modern biblical scholarship follows the  
septuagint. etc., in dividing the verses not as

102. (cont'd).

the Massorah does (i.e. - והוא יגיד עקב - and then  
 - ( מאשר שמנה ) but instead - והוא יגיד עקב -  
 and the next verse - אשר שמנה - connecting the  
 - 'ח - in - מאשר - with the ending of the previous  
 verse - עקב. The N.E.B. also ignores the - 'ח -  
 "Asher shall have rich food as daily fare, and provide  
 dishes fit for a king". Onkelos also ignores the  
 problematic - 'ח - in - מאשר - .

103. Neofiti, however, translates: - ונסב מאר -

104. See Mechilta de Rabbi Ishmael, M. Friedman, Vienna 1870.  
 Bashalach, pp. 24-25; Mechilta de Rabbi Shimon,  
 Beshalach, 13, p. 46. Midrash Hagadol, EX.p.249; Bab.  
 Tal.Sot.p.13<sup>a</sup>.

105. See N. Adler, Netinah-Lager; M. Levenstein, Nephesh-  
 Hager, v.1, Beshalach, p. 31.

106. Rabbi Ishmael, Beshalach, 6, p.39. cf. Mechilta de  
 Rabbi Shimon; Midrash Hagadol, EX. op.cit. p. 298.

107. cf. Ps. Jonathan - תפכר שור' בגלי דגב'הין דעמך - cf. Neofiti.

722  
NOTES  
GROUP C

108. See ch. Reverence to God, note 8.
109. See Mechilta de Rabbi Ishmael, Beshalach - מסכתא דרשב"ל - Parasha 2, p. 56; Midrash Hagadol, EX. op.cit. p.345; Pesikta, Buber 28; Pesikta Rabati, M. Ish. Shalom, p.51; Ibn Ezra; Rashbam; Nahmanides.
110. cf. Palest. Targum and Neofiti. Ps. Jonathan merely reads: - ואמר אלוהים ק"ם מ'מר א דר' - but not the word - שבועות. See N. Adler, Netiḥah-Lager.
111. The Midrashim and the Targumim take כס - in the sense of - כסא - throne. The LXX takes it in the sense of - כי' - "cover" - i.e. with covered hands God fought with Amalek. The Pesikta Rabati (p.51) takes it also in this sense - אמר רבי אבא בר יבהנא כל זמן שזרע - על עמלק ק"ם כביכול באילו הפנים מכוסות נעקר ורעו מן העולם נהגלו הפנים שהיו באילו מכוסות.  
See J. Komlosh. op. cit. p. 196, footnote 11.
112. For other interpretations on this word - כס - see M. Cassuto, EX. p.64.
113. Modern scholarship tends to assume that - כס - is a textual corruption for - כס - to correspond with the foregoing - ה' נס'.

114. See Bab.Tal.Sanh.p.20<sup>b</sup>.
115. See EX. Rabbah 42,9; Bab.Tal.Ber.32<sup>a</sup> where a similar explanation is given on DEUT.9<sup>14</sup> - "Let Me alone that I may destroy them". Tanhuma, Ki Tissa, p.123<sup>b</sup>. See also Onkelos and Ps. Jonathan in DEUT.9<sup>14</sup>
116. cf. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti.
117. cf. also Bab.Tal.Sheb.39<sup>a</sup>; Mechilta de Rabbi Ishmael, Yithro, Parasha 7, p.68<sup>b</sup>; Tosephta Yoma, ch.4; Midrash Aggadah, Buber, v.1, p.186; Pesikta de Rab. Kahana, p.167<sup>a</sup>; Midrash Hagadol, EX. op.cit.p.710. See also this Group, note 48; Group D, note 3.
118. cf. Ps. Jonathan; the Palest. Targum and Neofiti, however, translate literally - וְמוֹכִיחַ לֹא מוֹכִיחַ - (בְּיוֹם דִּינָא דְּבְרִי). -
119. See Siphra, Achare-Mot, Parasha 9,10:- וְחִי בָהֶם - לְעוֹלָם הַבָּא -  
וְאֵם תֵּאמַר בְּעוֹלָם הַזֶּה וְהָלֹא סוּפוּ מִתְּהָא מִתְּהָא מִקְדָּשׁ  
וְחִי בָהֶם לְעוֹלָם הַבָּא.  
Yalk. Shimoni, 596; Midrash Hagadol, LEV. p.519.

724  
NOTES  
GROUP C

120. cf. Ps. Jonathan:- 'וַיְהִי בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא וַיִּלְכְּדוּ אֶת צְדָקִיָּא אֲנָח ה' - Neofiti, however, translates literally. See Nahmanides and Ibn Ezra on verse 4. See Bab.Tal.Sanh.74<sup>a</sup>; D. Hoffmann, v.2, p.15; E.E. Urbach, The Sages, Their Concepts and Beliefs, p. 306.
121. cf. Siphra Parashat Emor, ch.17; Mechilta on EX.12<sup>27</sup>; Bab. Tal. Succ. p.11<sup>b</sup>; Mechilta de Rabbi Shimon on EX.12<sup>27</sup>, p.26; Tanhuma, Parashat Bo, 9; Midrash Hagadol, LEV. op.cit. p. 214.
122. Onkelos follows the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, but Rabbi Eliezer holds that the word - כֹּסֶל - must be taken literally in the sense of "booths". There are, however, different versions with regard to the argument of Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Akiva. In Mechilta de Rabbi Shimon, (EX.12<sup>27</sup>) :- רַבִּי עֲקִיבָא אָמַר  
סוֹכֵת מִמָּטָא וּכְלָא... רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר אָמַר עֲנַת כְּבוֹד.  
See also Midrash Hagadol, p.214. See D. Hoffmann, v.2, p. 207; Rabbi A. Ibn Ezra and Rabbi Samuel Ben Meir take the word "Booths" literally.
123. Ps. Jonathan follows Onkelos:- אֲרוֹחַ בַּמִּטְלֵת עֲנַת יִקְרָא -  
cf. Neofiti: To the Targumim, Rabbi Akiva's view is more plausible, for from their departure from Egypt the

NOTESGROUP C

123. (cont'd).  
Israelites were sheltered by the cloud of Glory  
by day and by the pillar of fire by night. cf. EX.13<sup>21</sup>.
124. See Siphra Behukotai 3; Midrash Hagadol, LEV.op.cit.  
pp.742-743.
125. See Neofiti who translates the first part of the verse  
like Ps. Jonathan: - ואשרת' - ואחר'ב ית מקדש' וכו'..
126. Rashi's source is Siphra Behukotai, ch.8,1: - בומן שהם  
תופסים מעשה אבותם דור אחר דור דוריהם נכונם על ידיהם.  
cf. Bab.Tal.Sanh. 27<sup>b</sup>. See EX.20<sup>5</sup>. See Rabbi A. Ibn  
Ezra and D. Hoffmann, v.2, pp.255-256. See Michasik  
Section Group D note 3; Midrashic Section Group A.  
note 22.
127. cf. Ps. Jonathan, Neofiti, however, translates  
literally: - ולחוד בחובי אבהתהון עמרהון יכסון
128. See The Pentateuch with Rashi's commentary by  
Silbermann, LEV. p.130, Appendix 1. See also Rabbi M.  
Malbim's commentary on the Siphra, LEV.26.<sup>43</sup>, ch.8,9.

## NOTES

## GROUP C

129. The expression -  $\text{וְיָצָא וְיָבִיעַ}$  - is also found in EZ. ch.13<sup>10</sup>; ibid. ch.36<sup>3</sup>. See D. Hoffmann, LEV. op.cit. p. 257; S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, p. 168; J. Komlosh, p. 199.
130. ch.8,9. cf. Bab.Tal.Bab.Bath. p.88<sup>b</sup>; Midrash Hagadol, LEV. op.cit. p. 765.
131. See Rabbi A. Ibn Ezra who follows the Siphra.
132. cf. The Palest. Targum:-  $\text{מַכְלָא מַלְךְ מַכְלָא, וְסִדְרִין מַלְךְ סִדְרִין}$ .
133. cf. Ps. Jonathan:-  $\text{וְגִיּוֹרָא דִּלְתַּבְּנָסָא בֵּיתֵהוּן}$   
 $\text{שְׂאִילוֹ שְׂאִלְתָּהּ -}$

It is difficult to perceive why Onkelos and Ps.

Jonathan did not translate -  $\text{הִתְאַוּ תְּאוֹרָה}$  - literally.

In DEUT.12<sup>15</sup> -  $\text{בְּכָל אוֹת נִפְעַךְ}$  - Onkelos translated

-  $\text{כִּי תִתְּאוֹרָה נִפְעַךְ}$  - cf. DEUT.12<sup>20</sup> -  $\text{בְּכָל רָצוֹת}$  -

Onkelos, once again, translated -  $\text{אֲרִי תִתְּרַעֲי}$ .

Perhaps, however, to avoid the merest hint that Israel could have been contaminated by the lust of the mixed multitude, the Targum apparently softens the meaning from lust [ $\text{> desire > request}$ ] to ask [ $\text{questions}$ ].



727  
NOTES  
GROUP C

133. (cont'd).  
Neofiti, translates literally:- וְיָרֵבּוּבָה.. אֲתִמְלִיכוֹתֵי מִלְדָּה  
See Section, Veneration, Groups, A, B, C and D.
134. Siphre, Behaalotecha, 36,3; cf. Yalk.Shimoni, 247;  
NUM. Rabbah, ch.15, 24; Lekah-Tov; Midrash Aggadah,  
Buber, v.2, p.98; Midrash Hagadol, NUM. p.165.
135. cf. Siphre, Piska 99; Yalk.Shimoni 738; Pirke Rabbi  
Eliezer, ch.53; Aboth de Rabbi Nathan, ch.9 - נְסֻחַה א'  
p. 122; Midrash Hagadol, NUM. pp.186-187. Midrash  
Aggadah, v.2, p.103; Pesikta Rabati, ch.26, p.130<sup>b</sup>;  
see , Veneration and Idealization of the Prophet Moses,  
Group C, note 1.
136. cf. Siphre, Behaalotecha, Piska 99; Midrash Hagadol,  
NUM. op. cit. pp. 186-187; Midrash Aggadah, v.2, p.103;  
Aboth de Rabbi Nathan, ch.2 - נְסֻחַה א' - and - נְסֻחַה ב'.  
Bab.Tal.Shab. p. 87<sup>a</sup>.
137. See Rabbi A. Ibn Ezra who takes "Cushite" to mean  
"black" - וַצְפוּרָה הִי תֵּה שְׁחֹרָה וְרוּמָה לְכוּעִיר -

728  
NOTES  
GROUP C

138. cf. The Palest. Targum and Neofiti: - וּשְׁפִירָא בְּחִזְקָה  
וּמִשְׁנֵא בְּעֻבְרִיא מִבְּא מִכָּל נְשִׂיא דְּלֶרָא הִרְדָּמָא -  
Ps. Jonathan believes that the text is not referring  
to Zipporah but to another Cushite woman whom Moses  
married when he became King in Ethiopia, and ultimately  
divorced her. cf. Rabbi Samuel Ben Meir.
139. The notion of divorce is probably not due so much to  
- אַחֲרָא שְׁלוּחִיה - in EX.18<sup>2</sup>, despite the principle of  
- אֵין מִיקְדָּשׁ וּמִאֲחִירָא בְּתוֹרָה - so much is to the word  
- אִדְוָרָה - because of its occurrence also in Jer.3<sup>8</sup>.
140. cf. Midrash Hagadol NUM. op.cit. p.194. Siphre  
Behaalotecha, Piska 84; Tanhuma, Beshalach 16; A. Geiger  
Hamikra-Ve-Targumav, pp.199-247.
141. cf. Siphre Piska, 105; Bab.Tal.Ned.64<sup>b</sup>; Sanh.102<sup>b</sup>;  
Midrash Aggadah, v.2, p.104.
142. cf. Ps. Jonathan, the Palest. Targum and Neofiti.  
Onkelos should be understood in the light of Palest.  
Targumim.

NOTESGROUP C

143. The words, "Pray now" are an addition on the part of Onkelos, having no words in the Hebrew text to correspond to it. This method is quite common in Onkelos. cf. Rashi, GEN.49<sup>24</sup>. See General Introduction, p.27. Perhaps, however, Onkelos takes - אל נא - in the sense of Prayer. - as the Rabbis state אין נא אל לטון בקעה cf. Rashi, GEN.22<sup>2</sup>. See S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, p. 188.
144. See Bab.Tal. Sot.34<sup>b</sup>; Yalk. Shimon, 743; Midrash Hagadol, NUM. op.cit. pp.205-206.
145. cf. Onkelos, GEN.32<sup>5</sup>: - וְדַדִּי לְיִשׁוּר וְחִמּוּר - וְהָיָה לִי תוֹרִין וְחִמּוּרִין -  
 NUM.12<sup>6</sup>: - עָן וְעַבְדִּין
146. Ps. Jonathan takes - אַבְנֵי - in the plural:-  
 - וְסִלְקוּ מִן צֶטֶר דְּרוּמָא וְאַתּוּ עַד חֲבֵרִין -  
 Neofiti makes it clear that the reference is to Caleb:-  
 - וְסִלְקוּ בְּדְרוּמָא וְאַתּוּ כָּלָב עַד חֲבֵרִין -  
 See Rabbi A. Ibn Ezra.
147. See Bab.Tal.Yoma 86<sup>a</sup>; Rashi, EX.34<sup>7</sup>; Tosephta Yoma, ch.4, Midrash Aggadah, Buber, v.1, p.186; Onkelos, EX.34<sup>7</sup>.

730  
NOTES  
GROUP C

148. See also this Group (supra), note 38. Also Halachic Section, Group D, note 3.
149. In GEN.25<sup>16</sup> Onkelos translates - עִירָהֶם - by - מִצְרֵיהֶם - "walled towns", in contrast to - כְּרִיתָיוֹן - which means - פְּצִמֵּיהֶם - "unwalled towns", i.e. "open". See Onkelos and Rashi. cf. also Psalms 69<sup>26</sup> and Targum Jonathan. Perhaps Onkelos' rendering of - עִירָהֶם - and Rashi's likewise, has been partly helped by the circumstance that in Hebrew - הֵיכָל - can mean both palace and Temple: the same being apparently assumed regarding - עִירָהֶם .
150. See NUM.25<sup>1-9</sup>.
151. Parashat Mattot, Piska 157; Midrash Hagadol, NUM. op.cit. p.540. cf. Ps. Jonathan.
152. See Rabbi A. Ibn Ezra; Rabbi Samuel Ben Meir; Nahmanides; Siphre in the name of Rabbi Josi-Ben Dormaskit.
153. Debarim, Piska 1; cf. Midrash Tannaim Hoffmann, p.2; Midrash Aggadah, v.2. pp. 174-175; Lekah-Tov; Debarim Zuta, p.14; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT, pp.6-9; Bab.Tal.Ber. 32<sup>a</sup>. See Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch.5, Injection of Derash and Halacha in Onkelos'Targum, notes 16-19.

NOTESGROUP C

154. This is most difficult to comprehend for the story of the quails occurred in "Kibroth-Hattaavah" (see NUM.11<sup>34</sup>) and not in Hazeroth. Ps. Jonathan, the Palest. Targum and Neofiti translate also like Onkelos. Perhaps because "Kibroth-Hattaavah" was very near to Hazeroth (see NUM.11<sup>35</sup>) that the whole area was termed Hazeroth. See S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, p.221.
155. cf. Ps. Jonathan, the Palest. Targum and Neofiti.
156. Piska 32. See also Bab.Tal. Ber.54<sup>a</sup>; Midrash Aggadah, v.2, p. 185; Yalk. Shimoni 247; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. op. cit. p. 130.
157. cf. Ps. Jonathan:- ובכל מקומו - Neofiti interprets that "the love" refers to the Torah of God - ותרמון ית' אולבן אור"תה דה' ובכל מקומו -
158. For the literal meaning of the text, see Rabbi A. Ibn Ezra and other classical commentators.

159. cf. Nahmanides who quotes Eccl. Rabbah, ch.7, 32:-  
 - אמר רב יאשיה מפת שלשה דברים הקב"ה מאריך מפני"ם לרשעים  
 בעולם הזה שמא יעשו תשובה או עשו מצות שהקב"ה ישלם שכרם  
 בעולם הזה או שמא יצאו מהן צדיקים.  
 cf. Bab.Tal.Ber.7<sup>a</sup>. On Psalm 36<sup>7</sup> Rabbi Akiva has this  
 to say:- "לרשעים משפיע להם שלוח ונותן להם שכר מצורד  
 קלות שעשו בעולם הזה כדי להפריץ מהם לעולם הבא."  
 See Yalk. Shimoni, Psalms 726; J. Komlosch, p.204. See  
 Bab.Tal. Irubin, p.22<sup>a</sup>:- "אמר רבי אילא לשונאיו הוא  
 ולא יאמר אבל יאמר הוא לצדיקים גמורים וה"נ דאמר  
 רבי יהושע בן לוי היום" לעשותם ולמחר לקבל שכרם."
160. Ps. Jonathan, /Palest, Targum and Neofiti take it also  
 in this sense.
161. cf. Siphre, Parashat Reeh, Piska, 128; Bab.Tal.Ber.9<sup>a</sup>:-  
 - אמר רבי אבא הכל מודים כשנגמלו ישראל ממצרים לא  
 נגמלו אלא בערב... וכשיצאו לא יצאו אלא ביום.  
 Midrash Tannaim, p.90; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. p.352:-  
 - לילה - וזכר לנשים שנעשו לך בלילה..
162. Ps. Jonathan explains that - לילה - refers to the  
 Paschal lamb which is eaten by night - ותיכלון יתיר -  
 - Neofiti appears to follow the Siphre:-  
 - ארז... מפיק יתכון ה' מלהיכון פריקין מן ארעא דמצרים  
 בלילה ועבד לכון נסין וגבון באיממה.

733  
NOTES  
GROUP C

163. cf. The Haggadah for Passover; Siphre, Ki-Tabo. Piska, 301; Lekah-Tov; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. op.cit. p. 587.
164. It may well be explained that the interpretation rests on the treatment of - מִבְּרִיחַ - not as Kal participle, but as a Poel perfect, - "attempted to destroy". For this meaning of the Po'el cf. - מִבְּרִיחַ - Ps. 101<sup>5</sup>; - עָוִן 1.Sam.18<sup>9</sup>. See Gesenius Hebrew Grammar 55, b, c, p. 151.
165. cf. Neofiti: Ps. Jonathan, however, does not identify the Aramean with Laban, but with Jacob. cf. Ibn Ezra. Rabbi S. Ben Meir identifies - מִבְּרִיחַ - with Abraham.
166. N.E.B. translates: "For the enemy have no rock like Ours in themselves, they are mere fools". It is difficult to see what etymology underlies this rendering for - בְּלִיָּה - is always taken in the sense of intervention, argument, plea, judgment, cf. Ps.106<sup>30</sup> - וַיַּעֲמֵד בְּנֶחֱם - מִלִּמַּר שָׁעָה בְּחַס בְּלִיָּה עַד קוֹנוֹ - see Bab.Tal.Sanh.p.44<sup>a</sup> - וַיִּפְלֵל. He pleaded with his Maker. cf. Ibn Ezra on Psalms; Bab.Sanh. p.111<sup>b</sup> - אֵין בְּלִיָּה אֵלָּא דִּינָא - וְאֵין בְּלִיָּה אֵלָּא דִּינָא שְׁמֵא מִרְּבִינָא בְּבִלְיָה - Meg.15<sup>b</sup> - וְאֵין בְּלִיָּה אֵלָּא דִּינָא. The translation of our verse is from the "Pentateuch with Rashi's Commentary".

NOTES  
GROUP C

167. See Siphre, Haazinu, Piska 323; Midrash Tannaim, p.199; Yalk. Shimoni, 946; Lekah-Tov; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT.p.723; Mechilta Mishpatim, EX.21<sup>22</sup>. Parasha 8:-  
- בפלילים - אין פלילים אלא דינן שנאמר ואיבנו פלילים.
168. cf. Onkelos, EX.21<sup>22</sup> and the other Targumim. With regard to our text cf. Ps. Jonathan, the Palest.Targum and Neofiti who take - בפלילים - in the sense of judges.
169. Siphre, Piska 347:- יחי ראובן ואל ימות - והלא מת הוא  
אלא מה תלמוד לומר ואל ימות - לעולם יבא -  
cf. Bab.Tal.Sanh.p.92<sup>a</sup>; Lekah-Tov; Midrash Tannaim, p.213 ff. Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. p.76r.
170. cf. Ps. Jonathan: יחי ראובן בעלמא הדין ולא ימות במיתותא  
דמיתין בה רשיעיא לעלמא דארתי וכו'...  
cf. the Palest. Targum and Neofiti.
171. This implies that Reuben will not be judged after his death like all the wicked people. cf. Ps. Jonathan and other Targumim. It may also mean that Reuben will not die a second death - once he is resurrected. cf. Jer.ch.51<sup>39</sup> -  
- ושנו שנת עולם ולא יקיצו נאם ה' -  
Jonathan translates - וימותין מותא תנינא ולא ימון לעלמא דארתי אמר ה' -  
See N.Adler, Netinah-Lager. On this subject see M.McNamara, The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum, pp.117-125.



172. See Rashi EX.32<sup>26-27</sup>; Bab.Tal.Yoma p.66<sup>b</sup>; Siphre Piska 350; Midrash Tannaim, p.216; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. op. cit. p. 764.
173. See Ps. Jonathan, the Palest. Targum and Neofiti who elaborate on the faithfulness of the tribe of Levi.
174. See Bab. Tal.Zeb. p. 54<sup>b</sup>; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. op. cit. p. 765; Siphre Piska 352.
175. Some Rabbis in Siphre (ibid) believe that the text refers to the Messianic era or the world to come.
176. cf. Ps. Jonathan, the Palest. Targum and Neofiti.
177. GEN. Rabbah 99, 9; - זבולון עוסק בפרקמטיא ויששכר עוסק בכורה -  
cf. also Siphre DEUT. Piska 354; Nahmanides.
178. The Targumim Ps. Jonathan, the Palest. Targum and Neofiti, however, take it like Rashi:-  
- חיון דבית זבולון במפקי כון לפרקמטיא -
179. cf. Ibn Ezra; I. Chron. ch.12<sup>33</sup> :- מוזבולון יוצא צבא -  
עורכי מלחמה -

NOTES  
GROUP C

180. Midrash Tannaim, p.218 takes it as Onkelos. cf. Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. p.770; Zohar Parashat Behaalotecha, Vilna 1882, p.150:-  
 ולבולון אמר שמח ובולון בצאתך וששכר  
 באהלך מלמד דאשתכחו כמלא, דא נפק ואגמ קרבא  
 ודא יתיב ולעי באור"תא וכא...-
181. Vezot Haberacha, Piska 354. cf. Midrash Tannaim, p.218 f; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. p.771.
182. The Palest. Targum and Neofiti follow Onkelos. However, Ps. Jonathan takes it as the Siphre (ibid):-  
 -אומין סג'עין למוור-בית מקדשא יצולון תמן יקרבו קורבטן-
183. By the lawgiver, Moses is meant, see Siphre, DEUT.Piska 355; Lekah-Tov; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. op.cit. p.772. . See, however, Ibn Ezra, who does not take "lawgiver" to mean Moses. See S. Luzzatto in his commentary on the Torah, p.568; M.D. Cassuto, p.122.
184. cf.Ps.Jonathan, the Palest.Targum and Neofiti; Sforino; Abarbanel; N. Adler, Netinah-Lager.
185. See Bab.Tal.Sot. p.13<sup>b</sup>.

186. In some instances Onkelos interprets the text in accordance with the "Derash" of the Rabbis but there is nothing parallel to it in Rashi. e.g. GEN.49<sup>27</sup> - Onkelos' interpretation is in line with Bab.Zeb.p. 54<sup>a</sup>; Siphre, DEUT. Piska 352; GEN. Rabbah 93, 12; ibid. 99, 1; Bab.Yoma p.12<sup>a</sup>; Zeb.p. 118<sup>b</sup>; Meg.26<sup>a</sup>. Again, EX.15<sup>1</sup> Onkelos' interpretation is in line with Rabbi Akiva's view in Bab. Sot. p.27<sup>b</sup>; Midrash Hagadol, EX. p. 284. Again, NUM.17<sup>27</sup> - Onkelos is in line with Midrash Aggadah, Buber, Korah, v'2, p.119; Lekah-Tov, v.2. p. 232; The other Palest. Targumim. Again, DEUT.33<sup>11</sup> Onkelos is in line with Rabbinic interpretation in Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. p. 765; Siphre Piska 352; Midrash Tannaim, p. 215.

NOTESMIDRASH - GROUP D

1. The Talmud often treats - זקן - as an abbreviation in the sense of - זה שקנה חכמה - one who has acquired wisdom. See Bab.Tal.Kid.p.32<sup>b</sup> - רבי יוסי הגלילי - אומר אין זקן אלא מי שקנה חכמה . -
2. See GEN. Rabbah 84,8: - רבי יהודה אומר שהיה - זין איקונין, שלו דומה לו. רבי נחמיה אומר של הלכות שמסרו שם וזבר cf. Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p.627. Rashi quoted Onkelos for no apparent reason, since the same interpretation is mentioned in the Midrash in the name of Rabbi Nehemiah. See Midrashic Section, Group A. We may, however, say that although the same interpretation occurs in the Midrash, nevertheless, Rashi takes the opportunity of elucidating the Targum for the benefit of its student. It may even be said that the commentaries of Onkelos and Rashi are almost inseparable and the student is advised to read them in conjunction in order to fully comprehend the biblical text. See Midrashic Section, Group C, note 17 infra 51.
3. The Rabbis, however, explain - זלד - in the sense of - בקדרה אשר בעלו בה נהבשר - זלד - pottage - "in the pot wherein they had cooked, therein were they themselves cooked". See Bab.Tal.Sot.p.11<sup>a</sup>.

NOTESGROUP D

4. See Mechilta, Beshalach, Parasha 6 (with regard to EX.15<sup>8</sup>):- נַעֲרָמוּ מִיָּד - בַּמֶּדֶה שֶׁמִּדּוּ מִדֶּרֶת לֵהֱיוֹת הָעָם  
אָמְרוּ הֵבֵה נִתְחַכְמָה לוֹ אֶף אֶתֶּה נִתְּתָה עֲרָמָה לְמִיָּד  
- וְהָיוּ הַמִּיָּד נִלְחָמִים בָּהֶם וְכוּ'...

cf. Midrash Hagadol, EX. op.cit. p. 300; Midrashic Section, Group A, note 21.

5. Onkelos:- כִּד מַשְׁלֵמִין בְּנֵא לְמַחֲשֵׁי בִּתְרֵא בְּחֵי הָיוּ  
Rashi. EX.34<sup>7</sup>.

6. cf. Bab.Tal.Sanh.27<sup>b</sup>; Ber. 7<sup>a</sup>; Midrashic Section, Group A, note 22; Midrashic Section, Group C, note 42.

7. Piska 17. cf. Midrash Tannaim, p.9; Lekah-Tov; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. p.28; Rashi LEV.19<sup>15</sup>; Midrash Hagadol, LEV. p. 547 ff; Siphra ch.4, Piska 37 and 38; Halachic Section, Group D, note 8, footnote 13.

8. See Bab.Tal.Sanh. 8<sup>a</sup>; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. p.665.

9. Onkelos:- דְּבִחוּ לְשֹׁדֵן דְּלִית בְּהוֹן צְרוּךְ דְּחָלָן דְּלֵא יִדְּגָנוּן.

10. See Siphre Piska 318: - יִזְבְּחוּ לַעֲשֵׂדִים - אֵילָיו הֵיוּ עֹבְדִים לַחֲמָה - וללבנה לבובביס ולמזלות ודברים שהם צורך הצולש והנאה לצולם בהם לא היה קנאה כפולה אלא הם עובדים לדבר שאין משיבין להם....  
cf. Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. op.cit. p. 713; Midrashic Section, Group A, note 34.
11. Parashat Haazinu: - לא אמן בד - בעש אתם שאין בכש אמונה - עמדתם לפני ה' סיני ואמרתם כל אשר דבר ה' נעשה ונשמע וכו'.. כיון שאמרו לעגל אלה אלהיך ישראל אף את אמרתי לכם אכן בארש תמותון וכו'...  
cf. Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. op. cit. p. 716.
12. cf. DEUT. 32<sup>40</sup>: - כִּי אֵשָׂא אֶל עַמִּי - where Rashi quotes Onkelos' translation and completes it by a midrashic interpretation.

NOTESMIDRASH - GROUP E (a)

1. The Persian word Parshandata, name of one of the sons of Haman, was divided into Parshan and Data - "expounder of the Law". This epithet is already mentioned in the poem attributed to Rabbi A. Ibn Ezra (died 1167). See M. Liber, "Rashi" translated from the French by Adele Szold, ch.6, p. 104; and ibid ch.9, p.207.
2. See chs. The Anthropomorphisms and Reverence to God.
3. For instance EX.21<sup>6</sup> -  $\text{לְעוֹלָם לְעוֹלָם}$  - If we are to take -  $\text{לְעוֹלָם}$  - in its literal sense - "For ever" - then this is in conflict with the current Halacha which states clearly that it only means (Bab.Tal.Kid.15<sup>a</sup>) the Jubilee. Halacha insists that it must be so understood as to be in agreement with the current form which the institution took, i.e. that service terminates with the Jubilee. On this text see Ibn Ezra; Rabbi S. Ben Meir's commentary; Halachic Section, Group B, note 4; Midrashic Section, Group E.(f) footnote 6.
4. See Judah Halevi - Cuzari, Zamose, 1796,3, p.73.
5. See A. Ibn Ezra, Yesod Mora, quoted by J.A. Moscato in Kol Yehudah (commentary on Cusari) 3, p. 73. On this subject see H. Albeck -  $\text{מבוא למשנה}$  - p.41; Abraham Weiss -  $\text{לחקר דת למד}$  - p.12 ff.

GROUP E (a)

6. Maimonides, Sefer Hamitzvot - שו"ע ב'. Also in his Introduction to the Mishna.
7. Z.H. Chajes, Introduction to the Talmud, Zolkiev, 1845, ch.17 - follows the former conservative view.
8. I.H. Weiss, Dor Dor Ve-doreshev, v.1. ch.18 and v.2. ch.11.
9. J.E. v.8, p. 571.
10. S. Rosenblatt, Bible Interpretation in the Mishna, Baltimore, 1935, p.5; Malbim in his Introduction to the Siphra.
11. e.g. in the case of the law - רחוק שבת (two thousand cubits in every direction). The Bab. Talmud (Irub. p. 51<sup>a</sup>) asks: - הנה אלפי שבת איך היכן כדאי? -  
Where is it written in the Torah the limits of two thousand cubits? Consequently, although this law is a Rabbinic enactment, yet the Talmud was groping around in search of a biblical text. See Rashi, Bab. Tal. Shab. p. 34<sup>a</sup>:  
- בעירובי תחומין - תיקון מעליא דאסמכא דבן תחומין  
אקרא, ואפילו למאן דאמר תחומין דרבן כואמרינן בעירובין  
דף נא. ילפינן מקום מקום וכו' -  
See Magid Mishne, Maimonides: - הלכות עירובין פ"ו. כד.



## NOTES

GROUP E (a)

11. cont'd.

The Palest. Tal.ch.6, Halacha 1, p. 39 states as follows:-

"רבי יוסה ב' רבי בון בשם רבי בא בר ממל אדם דן גזירה שוה  
לק"ס תלמוד ואין אדם דן גזירה שוה לבטל תלמודו."

This statement can only mean that the Halacha did not arise from the midrashic exegesis but on the contrary the midrashic exegesis was made in order to support the traditional Halacha. Furthermore, in this vein Rab Sherera Gaon's letter (p.39) should be understood:-

"וספרא וספרי דנשי דקראי אינון והיכא רמיון הלכתא בקראי  
ומעיקרא בבית שטע בימי דראשונים לפום ההיא  
אורחא הוּוּ תנא להון."

12. C. Taylor, Sayings of the Jewish Fathers, Cambridge, 1877, 3, 1.

13. See A. Geiger, Hamikra ve-Targumav, pp.69-102, with special attention to p.96. With regard to the differences between the Pharisees and the Sadducees, see *ibid.* Geiger, pp.110-127.

NOTESMIDRASH - GROUP E (b)

1. See Bab.Tal.Shab.63<sup>a</sup>; Yeb. 11<sup>b</sup>; ibid 24<sup>a</sup>; Ket. 38<sup>b</sup>.
2. See R. Loewe, The Plain Meaning of Scripture in Early Jewish Exegesis, p.164, note 112 (iii).
3. This is deduced from - מִיֵּךְ לִי - treated as - מְכַלִּילִי.
4. - פשטיה דקרא במאי כתיב, בתלמיד היושב לפני רבו דהע רבי חייא כי תשב ללחוש וכו'.. אמר יודע תלמיד ברבו שיודע להחזיר לו מעט גין, ואמר לאו תבין אשר לפניך וכו' פרוש הימנו.
5. - מערה בגד ביום קרה, מומן על נתר ושר בשירים על לב רע -  
The Hebrew word - מערה - is doubtful and some translate the text - "As one that taketh off a garment". See Jonathan's Targum; Ibn Ezra; Jastrow, v.2, p.1043, takes it from - גָּדַד - "to strip". Metsudath David explains as follows:- a man who does dress in a thin garment on a cold day because it looks smart, acts foolishly. See N.E.B.
6. Others translate - "As a small stone in a heap of stones. See A. Cohen, Proverbs, p. 174, cf. N.E.B.

NOTESGROUP E (b)

7. - אמר רבי וירא כל השונה לתלמיד שאינו הגון כוורק מבן למדקוליס שנאמר כצור מבן במרגמה בן נותן לכסיל כבוד.
8. Referring to a site of idolatrous worship.
9. - מרגמה - מבן שצוררין בו לא להתקיים היא שש שוומדת - Bashi: להזרק כך הנותן לכסיל כבוד אינו של קיימא. ורז"ל דרשו על המלמד תורה לתלמיד שאינו הגון שהוא כוורק מבן למדקוליס.
10. cf. Bab.Tal. Irub.23<sup>b</sup>; Arachim 8<sup>b</sup>; R. Loewe, The Plain Meaning of Scripture in Early Jewish Exegesis, pp.160-161.
11. cf. Bab. Tal.Pes.p.118<sup>b</sup>.
12. NUM. Rabbah, 18, 22,
13. GEN. Rabbah 10, 7: - רבי ינאי היה יושב ודורש בפניו ראה נחש - מרתיע ובא וכו'...  
See too ibid, ed. Theodor Albeck, p. 81.
14. Textual variant-ibid. See also GEN.Rabbah 47,8:-  
- מעשה היה יושב ושונה -
15. LEV. Rabbah 16,2, as quoted by Theodor Albeck: In edition New York, 1952, the reading is - ובעט -

GROUP E (b)

15. (cont'd).

In GEN. Rabbah 17,3, ed. Theodor Albeck, p.153 - יתבין -  
- פטשין. cf. ed. New York, 1952. See R. Loewe, op. cit.  
p. 157.

16. See DEUT.13<sup>7</sup> and Kid.80<sup>b</sup>.

17. ibid. Kid. 80<sup>b</sup>:- פשטיה דקרא במי כתיב? לא מיבעיא  
קאמר לא מיבעיא בן אב דסט ליה ועין ליה עצורד רעות  
אלא מפילו בן אם דלא סט ליה אימא צייתי ליה קמלן -

18. Parashat Yithro, 15.

19. In EX. Rabbah 40, 1, the reading is Rabbi Johanan  
Ben Turta.

20. ibid: -אמר להן העבודה לא נמנעתי לקרוא אלא על שלא סדרתי -  
אותה פרשה שטש שלשה פסמים שאין אדם רשאי לומר דברי  
תורה לפט הציבור עד שיפשוט אותו שנים שלשה פסמים.

- מיבעיתו מינא מידי ולא פשיטנא לכוון - See Bab. Kid. -25<sup>a</sup>

GROUP E (b)

21. See Bab.Tal.Yeb. p. 24<sup>a</sup>. Another piece of conclusive evidence can be seen from a passage in Palest. Tal. Horayot, ch.3, Halacha 4, p.18<sup>b</sup> where the two terminologies - דרש - and - פשט - are used interchangeably in one sentence: - רבי חנניה הוה מוסתמך ברב חיה בר בא - באיפוקן. תמא כל עמא פריי אמר ליה למה כל עמא פריי? אמר ליה רבי יוחנן יתיב דנש בבית מורשא דרבי בשיה וכל עמא מישמעיה. אמר בריך רחמנא דחמי לי פירין עד דאנא בחייס וכל אגדתא פשטית ליה חוץ ממעלי וקריה ליה.

Rabbi Hanania saw the people of Sepphoris running to the school. Inquiring about the reason, he was told that his disciple Rabbi Johanan - יתיב דרש - whereupon Rabbi Hanania gave thanks to God for seeing the fruits of his labour in his lifetime, for it was him who - וכל - taught Rabbi Johanan the Aggadah. See too Palest. Tal. Baba Metsia, ch.2, Halacha 11, p.10<sup>a</sup>.

22. See Bab. Sanh. p. 100<sup>b</sup>.

23. M. Gertner, Terms of Scriptural Interpretation: a study in Hebrew Semantics, Bulletin of the London School of Oriental and African Studies, XXV, 1, 1962, p.18 ff.

NOTESGROUP E (b)

24. See R. Loewe, op.cit. p.159, note 76<sup>a</sup>.
25. Some scholars believe that the Amoraim were fully aware of the distinction between Peshat and Derash. Others wish to accord this recognition also to the Tannaim (see S. Rosenblatt, The Interpretation of the Bible in the Mishna, Baltimore, 1935, p. 5f). But all this cannot be substantiated as can be seen from this chapter.
26. S. Rosenblatt, ibid, p.5 ff. believes that in the Mishna -**משנ**- may be identified with the simple or literal meaning of the text. See R. Loewe, p.159, note 78. What proof is there to assume that this is so when in fact the Mishna never used the verb -**משנ**- in this sense?
27. Dor Dor-ve-doreshav, v.1, ch.18, ed.Vilna, 1911, p.158.
28. Quoted and translated by R. Loewe, op.cit. p.176.
29. See Kid. p.49<sup>a</sup>:- **רבי יודה אומר המתרגם פסוק כצור גדול**  
**הרי זה בדאי והמוסיף גדליו וכו'.**
30. R.Loewe,op.cit.p.180. See(in Loc) and also other terminologies such as -**משמע**- and -**ודאי** . See also D.Hoffmann, LEV.in his Introduction,pp.3-8. But he dealt with this matter summarily.

## NOTES

MIDRASH - GROUP E (c)

1. GEN.3<sup>8</sup> - יו מרושי אגדה רביש, ונבר סידרוס רבודינו על -  
מכונס בב"ר ובטאר מדרשות, ואנ לא באתי אלא  
לפשוטו של מקרא ולאגדה המישבת דברי המקרא דבר  
דבור על אופניו.
2. In other words - אמורה - does not mean: let me die  
now, but if I were to die now, I should die with the  
comforting knowledge that you (Joseph) are still alive.
3. The Pentateuch with Rashi's commentary, N.E.B. trans-  
lates: "Judah was sent ahead that he might appear before  
Joseph in Goshen".
4. GEN.8<sup>7</sup>; EX.12<sup>4</sup>; LEV.25<sup>14</sup>; NUM.4<sup>47</sup>; NUM.14<sup>22</sup>; DEUT.1<sup>7</sup>;  
DEUT.4<sup>6</sup>; DEUT.26<sup>9</sup>.
5. See Table One, see E.M. Lifshits, "Rashi", p.167 ff.
6. See Rashbam Parashat Vayeshev: - ואף את שמואל ב"ר מאיר כתנו -  
וצ"ל נתוכחתי עמו ולפניו והודה לי שאילו היה לו פנאי היה  
צריך לעשות בירושם אחרים לפי הפשטות המתחדשים בכליוס.
7. See General Introduction, p. 16 ff. Introduction to  
Section, Rashi as Philologist; *ibid*, ch.8. Rashi and  
Menachem-Ben-Seruk.

NOTESGROUP E (c)

8. See Rashbam GEN.37<sup>13</sup> who quotes Rabbi Joseph Kara. Rashi also quotes the comments of Rabbi Menahem Ben Helbo. See I. Sam.19<sup>24</sup>; Is.10<sup>24</sup>; Ez.12<sup>3</sup>; Ez.45<sup>17</sup>; Amos 3<sup>12</sup>; Mal.3<sup>24</sup>; See E.M. Lifshits, "Rashi", p.159. M. Liber, "Rashi", op. cit. p.110; M. Waxman, A History of Jewish Literature, v.1, p. 193. On Joseph Kara's method, see S.W. Baron, A Social and Religious of the Jews, v.6, 2nd. edition, New York, 1958, p.475, with special attention to note 80. See also S. Efenstein - Introduction, בירוש' רבי יוסף קרא לנב'אים ראשונים, pp. 7-24.



NOTESMIDRASH - GROUP E (d)

1. See the above Section, Group E (b), *and* (c).
2. Perhaps the present meaning of Peshat is probably due to the earlier Spanish Lexicographers who sharply differentiate between the interpretation of the Rabbis which they called "Derash" and the "literal" meaning to which they gave the name "Peshat". We may even say that the present meaning of Peshat is due to Rab. Saadia Gaon as can be seen from his commentary on the Torah.
3. The Pentateuch with Rashi's commentary. N.E.B. translates....."who with staring eyes sees in a trance".
4. cf. Rashi NUM. 23<sup>21</sup> - לא קב"ט און - דבר אחר אחר פשוטו הוא  
נדרש כדרש נאד וכו'...
5. See GEN.4<sup>7</sup>; NUM.24<sup>7</sup>. See Midrashic Section, Group A, note 7.
6. It must be made clear, however, that when Rashi says - כמשמעו - he then has in mind the literal meaning of the text. See DEUT.22<sup>26</sup>; cf. Table One; I. Sam.15<sup>27</sup>.

NOTESGROUP E (d)

7. Rashi GEN.3<sup>22</sup> - ל - ויש מדרשי אגדה אבל אין מיושבין עגל - פשוטו וכו'...

See Table One.

8. See M. Jastrow, v.1, p. 599. This verb - ישב - is widely used by Rashi in his commentary on the Bab. Tal. and through it he seems to harmonise and settle all sorts of conflicting claims made by the Rabbis of the Talmud. - e.g. Ber.38<sup>b</sup>; ibid 63<sup>b</sup> s.v - ידד - Yom. 29<sup>b</sup>; s.v - אמר רבא - Ket.66<sup>b</sup> s.v - שבת ראשונה - Git.67<sup>a</sup> s.v - נמוקו - ולפי היכולת - See also Rashi's Introduction to Zech.1<sup>1</sup> - אין לב לישב המקור אור - cf. Rashi, Hosea 10<sup>9</sup>; Jer.33<sup>25</sup>; Ez.1<sup>4</sup>; Ps.16<sup>7</sup>; ibid.68<sup>34</sup>.

9. See, however, Halachic Section, Group G - where Rashi rejects the "Halachic deductions" of the Rabbis as they do not conform with the natural meaning of the text.

NOTESMIDRASH - GROUP E (e)

1. See GEN.1<sup>27</sup>; GEN.7<sup>16</sup>; GEN.8<sup>7</sup>; GEN.8<sup>11</sup>; GEN.9<sup>7</sup>; GEN.12<sup>3</sup>; GEN.12<sup>5</sup>; GEN.12<sup>11</sup>; GEN.14<sup>15</sup>; GEN.32<sup>31</sup>; EX.2<sup>6</sup>; EX.4<sup>2</sup>; EX.8<sup>2</sup>; EX.9<sup>32</sup>; EX.25<sup>28</sup>. For more references see Table One. Sometimes, without saying - וְכָל - but implying it: GEN.14<sup>16</sup>; GEN.38<sup>15</sup>; EX.15<sup>14</sup>. See this Midrashic Section, Group E (f) Rashi's Correlation of Peshat and Derash.
2. GEN.9<sup>27</sup>; GEN. 12<sup>17</sup>.
3. See M. Liber, Rashi, ch.6, p. 111.
4. See the above Section, Group E (d) Rashi's Occasional Reversion to the Talmudic Concept.
5. See GEN.50<sup>5</sup> - כִּי יִשְׁכַּח עַל הַלְשׁוֹן וְכֵן - כִּי יִשְׁכַּח עַל הַלְשׁוֹן וְכֵן.  
For more references see Table One.
6. See GEN.1<sup>1</sup> - "This verse calls for a Midrashic explanation". In several places, Rashi interprets midrashically without even offering the Peshat. See GEN.21<sup>17</sup>; GEN.25<sup>1</sup>; GEN.28<sup>11</sup>; GEN.28<sup>13</sup>; GEN.29<sup>11</sup>; GEN.37<sup>17</sup>; GEN.37<sup>22</sup>; GEN.37<sup>33</sup>; GEN.38<sup>1</sup>. The student of Rashi will find many more examples of this nature.

NOTESGROUP E (e)

7. cf. Ps. Jonathan. Neofiti reads - של-חין
8. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti follow Rashi's Derash.  
According to Neofiti the Angel's name was - שר-אל -  
LXX follows Onkelos.
9. See Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti: - והוא שאלה מתרגיץ בנ בלהה -  
cf. LXX; Rab. Saadia Gaon, p. 42.
10. cf. LXX. Ps. Jonathan: - ואשכחיה גבריאל בדמות גברא -  
cf. Neofiti: - וארץ יתיה מלאך בדמות גברא -
11. See Nahmanides who states that this is: - מליצה כרך לעג -  
See Midrashic Section, Group C, note 19; Section,  
Rashi as Philologist, ch.4. - Translations of Biblical  
Idioms into Aramaic.
12. See Midrashic Section, Group C, note 19.
13. See GEN.33<sup>10</sup> - where Rashi for no purpose takes  
- פני מלאכים - to mean - מלאך - "Angel". Onkelos,  
however, takes this expression to mean - אנפי דגבריאל -  
"important people".cf.Onkelos and Rashi GEN6<sup>2</sup> - בעהמלאהים -  
See Section on Anthropomorphisms, Group G, "Intermediary  
Elements", note 1. Also ibid, Group H, note 9.

755  
NOTES  
GROUP E (e)

14. cf. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti.
15. See Section on Anthropomorphisms, Group A, Motion and Place Denied God, note 2.
16. Onkelos:- אֵין אֶחָד בָּהּ - Although the text is in singular it is quite common for Onkelos to translate collective singulars as plural, e.g. GEN.32<sup>6</sup>; EX.12<sup>46</sup>; EX.22<sup>20</sup>; LEV.14<sup>41</sup>; NUM.22<sup>40</sup>; NUM.30<sup>13</sup>; cf. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti.
17. See Bab.Tal.Bab Bath.15<sup>a</sup> - where the word "tree" is taken in a metaphorical sense. Perhaps the Rabbis were influenced by the verse:- הָאָדָם עֵץ הַשֵּׁדֶה לְבוֹא עָלָיו בְּמָוֶר -
18. cf. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti.
19. See Bab.Tal.Sot.35<sup>a</sup>; Arach.15<sup>a</sup>.
20. The reader will find in Rashi many more examples of this nature.

GROUP E (e)

21. See Table One. See NUM.22<sup>40</sup> - וַיִּזְבַּח בֹּלֶק צֹאן וּבָקָר - where Rashi discards Onkelos and interprets midrashically.

22. In other words one who reiterates his claim without adducing any evidence.

23. cf. Bab.Tal.Sanh.7<sup>b</sup>; Siphre, (Pardes Malbim) 16.  
cf. Rashi DEUT.1<sup>12</sup>. cf. GEN.36<sup>39</sup> - בֵּית מִן זֶרַע - where Rashi interprets midrashically and ignores the Peshat of Onkelos.

24. See Bab.Yeb.47<sup>a</sup> - מִכְנָאן אִמֶּר רַבִּי יְהוּדָה גֵּר שְׁנֵת גֵּר -  
בְּבֵית דִּין הָרִי זֶה גֵּר.

We may, however, say that Onkelos, being himself a proselyte, nearly always renders the biblical - גֵּר - by - גֵּר - "proselyte" - because of his personal involvement. Rashi sees that the context excludes this meaning and provides a purported etymology for - גֵּר - (from - גֵּרָא) to substantiate the normal biblical meaning of resident stranger. At any rate the literal meaning is (always) stranger (i.e. resident alien) in biblical Hebrew, and it is only in post-biblical Hebrew that it acquires the meaning of convert to Judaism.

## NOTES

MIDRASH - GROUP E (f)

1. See Midrashic Section, Group E (c) Rashi and Peshat and Group E (e) Rashi and Derash, General Introduction, p.16 ff.

2. See M. Liber, op.cit. ch.6, p.124.

3. Rabbi Joseph Kara, contemporary of Rashi, who believed that the Peshat should not be deprived from its rights has this to say on the Derash of the Rabbis: I Sam.1<sup>17</sup>:-

- יתן את שלתך - כמו שאילתך. כאן השמר לך פן תנקט אחרי הסומים הפותרים יתן דונ"ר בלע"ז בלשון בקשה ונמצא עוקרין בפיתרון תיבה זה כל הפרשה שאם תפתר יתן לשון בקשה נעו מעגלותיה על פרשה זו... אם לא תלחץ ותסמוך על המורש שאמרו רבותינו שנה שנוול בזה שמואל היה קול יוצא בעזרה, שנה זו יולד בן ושמו שמואל והוא ישיע... אף חנה כשנפקדה הוציאה שמו שמואל, אמר לה אלכנה אישה שבי ער גמלך אותו אך יקם ה' את דברו שיצא קול בעזרה אל הילד. בדבר זה תוכל לדחות המציקים לך, אך דע לך כשנכתבה הנבואה שלימה נכתבה עם פירושה וכל הצורך שלא ינשלו בה דורות הבאים וכו'... ואין צריך להביא ראיה ממקום אחר ולא מורש כי תורה תמימה נכתבה נכתבה ולא תחסר כל בה. ומורש מכמינו כדי להגדיל תורה... אבל כל מי שאינו יורץ פשוטו של מקרא ונוטה לו אחר מורשו של דבר כזוה ששפזפתהו שכולת הנהר... ואילו עש לבוא אל דבר ה' היה חקר אחר פשר דבר ופשוטו. פירוש רבי יוסף קרא לנביאים ראשונים, See also, ibid, 2 Sam.12<sup>30</sup>.

מהד' שמעון צפנשאטין מוסד הרב קוק ירושלים - 1972.

GROUP E (f)

4. cf. Rashi GEN.1<sup>5</sup>; GEN.6<sup>7</sup> with GEN. Rabbah.
5. See Rashbam Parashat Vayeshev.
6. See Rashbam EX.21<sup>6</sup>:- וְעַד לְעוֹלָם - And he (the slave) shall serve him (the master) for ever. While according to the current Halacha this means until the "Jubilee", Rashbam takes it to mean - "for ever" -  
 - לְבִי הַפֶּטֶט כָּל יְמֵי חַיָּו - See Ibn Ezra; Halachic Section, Group B, note 4; Also this Section, Group E. (a), Origin and Development of Halacha, footnote 3.
7. See E.M. Lifshits, Rashi, p.176; M. Liber, Rashi, p.109. Rashi LEV.23<sup>II</sup>, Men.66<sup>a</sup>. Rashi Prov.9<sup>7</sup>:-  
 - וּמִוֹכִיחַ לְרֹשֶׁעַ מִיָּמֹו - מִוֹכֵחַ הוּא לְמִוֹכִיחַ עֹשֶׂה מַחֲרִיבֵי וְאֵינֶנּוּ שׁוֹמְרֵי לוֹ. וְהוּא  
 אֲזַדְרָה שְׂמֵסוֹר לְדַבֵּר עִם הַמְּסִיתִים מִדִּקְדָּשָׁהּ אֲפִילוֹ לְהוֹכִיחַם וּלְקַרְבָּם  
 By the phraseology - [לְהוֹכִיחַם] וּלְקַרְבָּם - Rashi  
 dearly had in mind the Karaites and not the Christians.  
 See General Introduction, p.20; Moshe Max Ahrend, *Le Commentaire sur Job de Rabbi Yosèph Qara*, Hildesheim, 1978, p.9, note 76. cf. also p.2 ff.
8. As a result, for example, the Feast of Weeks (Shavuot) falls on the 50th day following the Saturday of the



GROUP E (f)

8. (cont'd)  
Passover week in accordance with the literal meaning of the text LEV.23<sup>11</sup> and is therefore always on a Sunday. The Rabbanites, of course, follow the Talmud and interpret the above text in a different manner. See Rashi LEV.23<sup>11</sup> and Bab. Tal. Men. 66<sup>b</sup>.
9. EX.16<sup>29</sup>; EX.22<sup>8</sup>; EX.33<sup>2</sup>.
10. cf. LEV.13<sup>6</sup>. See Halachic Section, Group G; General Introduction, p.17.
11. Published in some Prayer Books of the Sephardi rite. See Kerem Hemed 4; E.M. Lifshits, Rashi, p.168. It was written 7th December, 1158, when Ibn Ezra visited England. See N. Golb, History and Culture of the Jews of Rouen in the Middle Ages, Tel Aviv, 1976, p.54 and p.60. See also E. Margalioth - "היחס שבין פירוש הרשב"ם - לפירוש הראב"ע על התורה (בספר מסף לכבוד פרופ' שמחה מסף) מוסד הרב קוק ירושלים תש"ג-366. p.  
The Karaites, themselves, agree with Ibn Ezra's interpretation on GEN.1<sup>5</sup>. See אליהו בע"צ אדרת אליהו - Israel, 1966, ch.3.
12. See Ibn Ezra, EX.13<sup>9</sup>, who accused Rashbam for interpreting the text against the tradition of the Rabbis - והיה לך - יש מולקין על אבותינו הקדושים שאמר - כי לאות ולזכרון על דרך לזית מן השם לראשית וענקים לגרירתך. גם וקשרתם לאות על ידך כמו קש - על לוח לבך וכו'...

NOTESINTRODUCTION - RASHI AS PHILOLOGIST

1. cf. this Section, ch.9. Onkelos and the Hebrew Grammar.
2. See Midrashic Section, Group E (f) Rashi's Correlation of Peshat and Derash.
3. See General Introduction, p.15 and p. 24.
4. cf. *ibid* General Introduction, p. 27.
5. See this Section, ch.8, Rashi and Menachem Ben Seruk.  
See also *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Keter, v.11, p.1305.
6. *ibid.* ch.8, Rashi and Menachem Ben Seruk.
7. Menachem's *Mahberet* is arranged under headings in alphabetical sequence of biliteral units. Each one of these headings had its subdivisions in which specific words are put together under a suitable general heading.
8. The distinction could easily be seen from comparing the commentaries of Radak and Ibn Ezra with that of Rashi.
9. See Rashi EX.27<sup>3</sup> with regard to the privative use of the Piel.

INTRODUCTION

10. cf. GEN.32<sup>6</sup>.

11. cf. Rashi GEN.2<sup>19</sup> - וכל אשר יקרא לו האדמה - סרסיהו ופרעהו  
כל נפש חיה אשר יקרא לו האדמה שם וכו'...

12. cf. Rashi GEN.1<sup>11</sup> - תדעם הארץ דשא עשב - לא דשא  
לשון עשב ולא עשב לשון דשא וכו'...

13. cf. Rashi GEN.41<sup>35</sup> s.v - את כל אכל. In his commentary  
on Ez.1<sup>11</sup> Rashi has this to say: - ופניהם - אלמלא שראיתי -  
שעם זקף גחול נקוד על ופניהם לא הייתי יורד לפרט  
אבל הנקוד למדנו להבדילם זו מזו ולהעמיד תיבת  
ופניהם בפני עצמה וכו'...

14. Joseph Pereira-Mendoza, Rashi as Philologist, Manchester  
University Press, 1940.

15. See this Section, ch.1, Rashi's Use of Onkelos' Targum.

16. See this Section, ch. 2, Rashi's Use of Onkelos' Targum  
with<sup>out</sup> Identifying Him.

17. See this Section, ch. 3 - Free Translation.



NOTES

CHAPTER 1 - RASHI'S USE OF ONKELOS'  
TARGUM WITH REGARD TO NOUNS AND VERBS

1. The word - לָרַז - means to glow, to heat, hence sharp as a blade. See Rashi EX.7<sup>11</sup>.
2. cf. Onkelos DEUT.13<sup>17</sup> who translates - רַחֲבֵרָה - by  
 - לִגְיָה פְּרִיָּה
3. Rashi supports Onkelos from GEN.41<sup>40</sup> - וְעַל פֶּן יִשָּׁךְ כָּל עַמִּי -  
 Perhaps from - מַשָּׁךְ - acquisition, possession. See  
 B.D.B. p.606. See also A. Ibn Shoshan, Hebrew Dictionary,  
 Jerusalem 1959, v.2, p. 942.
4. From the verb - בָּצַר - to cut off, to make something  
 inaccessible to the person concerned. Rashi supports  
 him from Psalms 76<sup>13</sup>. cf. DEUT.1<sup>28</sup>; Neh.9<sup>25</sup>.
5. cf. Is.22<sup>4</sup>; EX.5<sup>13</sup>.
6. cf. Jer.9<sup>3</sup>. See also B.D.B. ibid, p. 784.
7. cf. this Section, ch.6, The Influence of Aramaic  
 Language on the Hebrew.
8. See Rashi who brings other references from the Bible,  
 as well as from the Mishna.

764  
NOTES  
CHAPTER I

9. See S. Luzzatto on the Torah, p.215.
  
10. A. Ibn Ezra interprets - משריבה - by - משריב לל -  
"to exalt oneself" - מגזירת סלסלה ותרוממך  
cf. B.D.B. p. 699.
  
11. See Nahmanides and Ibn Ezra who take it as - מלח סוּמִית -  
"that the incense should contain salt. Rabbi D. Kimhi,  
ibid, p. 233 agrees with Rashi.
  
12. See Halachic Section, Group F, footnote 1.
  
13. cf. Onkelos, NUM.32<sup>17-20</sup>.
  
14. cf. DEUT.19<sup>19</sup> - ועשיתם לו כאשר זמם לעשות לאחיו -  
See Nahmanides.
  
15. See this Section, ch.8, Rashi and Menachem Ben Seruk, note 8.
  
16. cf. NUM.3<sup>10</sup>.
  
17. cf. Jud.20<sup>15</sup>.

18. Onkelos translates the text in plural - ויד מעיכי נפ'חין - Although the text is in singular, it is quite common for Onkelos to take it in plural. cf. EX.12<sup>46</sup>; LEV.14<sup>41</sup>; NUM.30<sup>13</sup>. Ps. Jonathan, however, takes it in singular - ויד כרסך מנפחא -
19. On the word - ויצל - (GEN.31<sup>9</sup>). See D. Yellin - וואס לייהורה (לכבוד יהורה אריה בלוי) - Budapest 1926, p.167; J. Komlosch, *ibid.* p. 125.
20. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti read like Onkelos - וארבי - N.E.B. reads: "I will take back part of that same spirit which has been conferred on you and confer it on them".... See Section, Veneration and Idealization of the Prophet Moses, Group C, note 2.
21. cf. Rashi EX.32<sup>24</sup> - אורי-כתרגומו אתריך לשון גירושין - cf. Rashi and Onkelos NUM.14<sup>24</sup>; S. Luzzatto, *Oheb-Ger.* p.67, note 262 argues with Rashi.
22. cf. Rashi GEN.45<sup>11</sup> - תורט - כתרגומו כלמא תתמסכן -
23. See N. Adler, *Netinah-Lager.* See this Section, ch 7. *Rejection of Onkelos' Translation* note 7.

CHAPTER I

24. cf. EX.10<sup>2</sup> - אֶת־אֲשֶׁר־הִתְעַלְלָהּ - Jud.19<sup>25</sup>; Jer.38<sup>19</sup>.  
The other root - עָלָל - whence - עֲלִילָה - tremendous acts,  
(cf.Lam.1<sup>22</sup>, Lam.3<sup>51</sup>) should be kept separate.
25. See Ibn Ezra and N.E.B.
26. However, Job.22<sup>21</sup> shows that the root can be used to  
express familiarity, and hence "learning about" a person.
27. cf. Jer.3<sup>21</sup>; Nahmanides. Ps. Jonathan reads - וְאִילָּל -  
- גִּחִין בְּחִי'וֹלָל. It appears he holds like the Midrash  
that Balaam was a lame person (from - שָׁפִיפוֹן עַל־אֶרֶץ -  
GEN.49<sup>17</sup>): - אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן בִּלְעָם חָגַר בְּרִגְלוֹ אֶת־הָיָה -  
שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר וְיָלַךְ שָׁפִי -  
See Bab. Tal.Sanh.105<sup>a</sup>; Yalk.Shimoni, Balak, 765;  
Midrash Hagadol, NUM. p. 411.
28. See Bab.Tal. Sanh. 105<sup>a</sup>.
29. See A. Ibn Ezra. The Vulgate takes it also in the  
sense of blind. "Obturatorus" - (eye stopped up).  
See J. Komlosh, ibid.  
p.135. N.E.B. however, reads:- "The man whose sight is  
clear".



NOTESCHAPTER I

30. Ibn Ezra explains - *לעשות דבר בסתר - by דבר נסתר*.  
This is because the hypocrite (*חנף*) does everything on the quiet.
31. See M. Jastrow, v.2, pp. 1126-1128. cf. DEUT.28<sup>4</sup>.
32. The word - *עשרת דורות* - may have some connotation with the goddess of Canaan - Ishtar, "Astarte". See B.D.B. p.800. See also this Section, ch.8, Rashi and Menachem Ben Seruk, note 3.
33. cf. LEV.11<sup>44</sup>; LEV.20<sup>7</sup>. In the sense of prostitution, see DEUT.23<sup>18</sup>; Hosea 4<sup>14</sup>; I Kings 19<sup>24</sup>; I Kings 22<sup>47</sup>; II Kings 23<sup>7</sup>.
34. See this Section, ch.3, Free Translation.
35. cf. Ps. Jonathan. Neofiti reads - *וּתְלַע לְרִיחַן*.
36. Rab. Saadia Gaon and Rabbi David Kamhi follow Onkelos. It should not be confused with the word - *שְׂעִירִים* - in LEV.17<sup>7</sup> or Is.13<sup>21</sup> - meaning "demons", "satyrs".

768  
NOTES  
CHAPTER 1

37. S. Luzzatto in his commentary on the Torah, p. 560.  
Since the speaker of the section in question is Moses,  
Luzzatto's interpretation needs no refutation and at  
any rate is far fetched.
38. cf. Esther 2<sup>7</sup> - "And he brought Hadassah up". cf.  
Lam.4<sup>5</sup>; Ruth 4<sup>16</sup>.
39. cf. GEN.15<sup>6</sup>; EX.4<sup>5</sup>; EX.14<sup>31</sup>; EX.17<sup>12</sup>; NUM.14<sup>11</sup>; DEUT.1<sup>32</sup>;  
DEUT.28<sup>66</sup>; HAB.2<sup>4</sup>.
40. cf. this Section, ch.6, The Influence of Aramaic  
Language on the Hebrew, note 14; Also ch.7, Rejection of  
Onkelos' Targum, note 14.
41. Piska 343.cf. Midrash Hagadol, DEUT.p.754; Palest.Tal.  
Shekalim, ch.6, Halacha 1; Palest.Tal.Sot.ch.8, Halacha 3.
42. cf. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti.
43. See W.Bacher, Die Jüdische Bibellexegese, Trier, 1892, p.21 -  
quoted by J. Komlosch, p.206.
44. See Midrashic Section, Group A, note 36.

## NOTES

CHAPTER 2 - RASHI'S USE OF THE  
TARGUM WITHOUT IDENTIFYING ONKELOS

1. cf. Ps. Jonathan, Palest. Targum and Neofiti. The Targumim elaborate on the evilness of Esau's wives.

2. In EX.13<sup>17</sup> Onkelos does not translate - נחם - literally, but rather - פן יוּעִין - "shaken", "afraid". This is because, as said in ch.1, note 36 (see this Section, ch.3, Free Translation) Onkelos translates according to the context of the subject and not according to the literal meaning of the text. In GEN.6<sup>7</sup> - Onkelos translates: - כִּי נִחַמְתָּ - by - ה' בְּמִימְרָהּ . In DEUT.32<sup>36</sup> - וְעַל עֲבֹדוֹתֶיךָ - instead of the usual translation - יִרְפָּרְעֵי - Onkelos translates - יִרְדֵּב - punishment, vengeance. On the latter Ps. Jonathan reads - רָחַם - from - רָחַם - regret, repentance. In Is.1<sup>24</sup> Jonathan translates the Niphal - אָפַקְתָּ - by - פָּרַעְנוֹת - "punishment". Jonathan, however, is not consistent for in Jer.42<sup>10</sup> translates - כִּי נִחַמְתָּ - by - אֲרֵי יִבְרַח - . On the whole, the tendency of Onkelos, as well as other Palest. Targumim, when confronted by anthropomorphisms is familiar, and led them to various periphrases. See Section, Anthropomorphisms. The verb - נחם - can also mean to console, to comfort, as e.g. Is.51<sup>12</sup>; Is.52<sup>9</sup> - or in the sense to have compassion e.g. DEUT.32<sup>36</sup>. In this verse N.E.B.explains - מִתְנַחֵם - by - "Esau your brother is threatening to kill you". Rabbi D.Kimhi takes

CHAPTER 2

2. cont'd.

it in the sense of consolation - כחילו קבל תנחומין -

- See Ibn Ezra, S.D. על מיתתך כי חשב להורגך -

Luzzatto in his Commentary on the Torah, p.115 - takes

it in the sense of - חשב - "to consider". Rab. Saadia

Gaon, p.37 takes it as Onkelos:- וואס לך להורגך -

3. With regard to the large number of words to render- נחם - see Raphael Loewe, "Jerome's Treatment of an Anthropopathism" Vetus Testamentum - Leiden 1952, pp.261-272. See also Section, Anthropomorphism, Group C, References to Human Emotions, note 1. See this Section, ch.3 note 12. Also ch.7 note 15
4. The nearest word to - ערב רב - is - והאפסוס - in NUM.11<sup>4</sup> - which Onkelos translates by - ורברבין -
5. cf. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti.
6. cf. Bab. Tal. Ker.5<sup>a</sup>.
7. His Commentary on the Torah, pp.232-233.
8. His Commentary on the Torah, p.75.

CHAPTER 2.

9. See also Cassuto in his commentary on EX.p.280 and S. Luzzatto, p. 379 who follow Onkelos.
  
10. See Bab.Tal.Shab.105<sup>a</sup>; Men.66<sup>b</sup>; Siphra Vayikra, Parasha 13; Midrash Hagadol, LEV.p.69. Perhaps the word - כר - is an inversion of - רך - "soft".
  
11. Ps. Jonathan translates - קמח קלי ופירוכין - Neofiti reads - גרע פירוכין - *see supra, Table Three* p. 306.
  
12. The word - מל - is from - מלל - to rub, scrape, to rub ears of wheat. cf. Bab.Tal.Bets.12<sup>b</sup> - מולל מלי לור - <sup>9</sup> - ומפרכין - See II Chron.2 - חטים מככות - see in Loc. Rabbi D. Kimhi and Rashi.
  
13. cf. Rab. Saadia Gaon op.cit.p.119 - מתאוננים - במתקוללים ברעה - *see Siphre, Piska 85. See this section ch. 3 note 9.*
  
14. p. 59.
  
15. See S. Luzzatto (on the Torah), p.456:- מתאוננים - מעורש אמן הידוע בערבית, וכן בדברי מ"ל אטנות ואיננו מעורש און.

16. cf. Siphre, Piska 100. See Rabbi A. Ibn Ezra and Rabbi Samuel Ben Meir.
  
17. See S. Luzzatto who explains the text according to Onkelos.
  
18. cf. Hosea 10<sup>12</sup>; Jer.4<sup>3</sup>.
  
19. cf. I Kings 15<sup>4</sup>; II Kings 8<sup>19</sup>; II Chron.21<sup>7</sup> - cf. Rab. Saadia Gaon, p.125; Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti take it as Onkelos. Rabbi David Kimhi, p.267, however is in line with Ibn Ezra.
  
20. See Bab.Tal.Shab.125<sup>a</sup>; Men.66<sup>b</sup>; Tanhuma, Balak 9; NUM. Rabbah, 20,16; Midrash Hagadol, NUM. p. 408.
  
21. See B. Judah Berkovitch - חל' פורת שמלור - Vilna 1874, p. 113.
  
22. cf. Nahmanides who quotes Onkelos. A. Ibn Ezra takes it from - רצה - "wring out". On this verb see B.D.B. p.936. S. Luzzatto (on the Torah), p. 482 explains:-  
 - ירע - בלשון ערבית סכנה והעחתה .  
 See also Rabbi M. Ben Eliyahou's Commentary on NUM. p.151 - who explains:-  
 - ירע - לשון סגירה ועכוב

CHAPTER 2.

23. Neofiti translates - סטת מן אורחא לקבל לי -

24. Literally, according to Rashi - קטב - is "to cut".  
This is because Rashi equates - קטב - with - קצב - "to cut". cf. Rashi, Hosea 13<sup>14</sup>.

25. Piska 321 - וקטב מרירי - לפי דרכנו אתה למד שכל  
מי שהעיד נכנס בו שהוא מרירי -

In Malbim ed. Pardes, Jerusalem 1957, the reading is -  
שכל מי שהעיד בו מורר -

26. See Midrash Tannaim (ed. Hoffman) p.197; Midrash Hagadol,  
DEUT. p.718 - reads - מי שהעיד נכנס בו הוא מריר -

27. See I. Levy's Targum Lexicon, v.2, p.412.

28. See Bab.Tal.Ba. Bathra 73<sup>a</sup>; Irub.18<sup>b</sup>. See A. Kohut,  
Angelologie and Demonologie, pp. 86-88; J. Komlosch, p.137;  
M. Jastrow, v.2, p. 1458 s.v - רוחין

NOTESCHAPTER 2

29. cf. Ps. Jonathan. Neofiti translates differently.
30. See Siphre Piska 326 - where various interpretations are offered; Midrash Tannaim (ed. Hoffman) pp.201-202.
31. See S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, p.280.
32. cf. The Vulgate "cum EO". Also N.E.B. "and with Him were myriads of holy ones".
33. cf. Siphre, Piska 353; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT.p.769; Midrash Tannaim(ed. Hoffman), p.217; Rabbi D. Kimhi, p. 288; Rab. Saadia Gaon, ed. Kafih, p.154.
34. See S. Luzzatto (on the Torah), p.567 - who explains:-  
 לא אהירח מבשלים שאם כן אין טעם לר'בוי  
 ירמ'ם  
 Rabbi A. Ibn Ezra's comment:- וואמר ירמ'ם בעבור  
 שיתחדשו והם רבים בשנה אחת.  
 is not convincing, as Luzzatto rightly remarked.
35. cf. Neofiti:- Ps. - וכוּמִי עוֹלִמוֹתֵהוּן יוֹמִי סִבְרִיהוּן  
 - והן כוּמִי מַלְיוֹתֵהוּן הַיְכָלִין יְהוֹן תְּקִיפִין  
 - בְּסִבְרֵיהוּן -  
 See Nahmanides who quotes the exact wording of the Palest.Targum. See Midrash Lekah-Tov, v.2, p.131:-  
 - כִּימִי בַחֲרוּתֵךְ כִּךְ יִמִּי וְקִנְיֹתֵךְ -



36. J. Komlosh, p.139 suggests that Onkelos is not like the other Targumim. He offers, however, no proof to support his argument and as said Onkelos should be studied in the light of other Targumim.
37. Piska 355. See Rashi's second interpretation.
38. p.179. See also S. Luzzatto on the Torah, p. 568.

NOTESCHAPTER 3 - FREE TRANSLATION

1. cf. also this Section, ch.1, note 36.
2. cf. Ps. Jonathan. Neofiti reads -  $\text{למערב וימא}$  - See Ibn Ezra.
3. It could, however, be argued that Rashi, following the Midrash and starting from -  $\text{מזרח}$  = direction, is independent of Onkelos who paraphrases by rest, but that the two converge - rest  $\xrightarrow{\quad}$  evening  
west  $\xrightarrow{\quad}$
4. Rab. Saadia Gaon, p.15 translates  $\text{לרוח-בנחת עת תנועת מים}$   
See Nahmanides, who takes -  $\text{לרוח}$   $\rightarrow$  - in its literal sense and that God made it like any other day so that Adam and Eve should not be frightened. See Palest.Tal. Ber.ch.4, Halacha 1; S.Luzzatto in his Commentary on the Torah, p.29.
5. Targum Onkelos, p.201.
6. The N.E.B. seem to be undecided about the correct translation of this difficult word - "at the time of the evening breeze".

CHAPTER 3

7. cf. Neofiti. Ps. Jonathan reads - עיבור לך תיבורתא  
דקיסין קרדוטן
8. See A. Geiger, Hamikra ve-Targumav, pp.295-296.
9. cf. Rashi GEN.20<sup>9</sup>. See I. Levy in his Dictionary to the Targumim, v.2, p.411.
10. cf. Pirke Rabbi Eliezer, ch.26; Yalk.Shimoni 247,91; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. pp.332-333. Onkelos and Rashi are perhaps both influenced - certainly Rashi - by the fact that - וילדו - although in the context refers both to Abimelech and his womenfolk, is strictly speaking masculine; the text could have been expected to end - וילדנה. Hence Rashi interprets - כי צר צר - cf. Bab. Bab. Kamma 92<sup>a</sup>. שכבת זרע - אמר רבי אלעזר שתי עצירות הללו למה? אחת באיש שכבת זרע שתיים באשה שכבת זרע ולידה וכו'.
11. See Onkelos GEN.13<sup>6</sup> - where Onkelos translates ולא יכלו - cf. - ולא יכלו - by - (לשבת יחדיו) - also Onkelos, EX.7<sup>21</sup>; EX.9<sup>11</sup>; EX.12<sup>39</sup>; EX.15<sup>23</sup>; NUM.9<sup>6</sup>. Ps. Jonathan translates like Onkelos, but Neofiti translates literally - ולא יכלין

12. See GEN.Rabbah 84,9; Yalk.Shimoni 247,141; Lekah-Tov; Sechel Tov; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. pp.627-628.
  
13. cf. EX.30<sup>12</sup>
  
14. cf. Onkelos GEN.40<sup>20</sup> - וַיֵּשֶׁא [חַת רֹאשׁ הַמַּשְׁקִים] -  
 by - וַיִּדְכֹּר - Ps. Jonathan in verses 13 and 19  
 follows Onkelos, but in verse 20 he translates - וַיֵּשֶׁא -  
 by - וַיִּרְוּמוּ. In verse 19 Onkelos renders - וַיֵּשֶׁא -  
 by - וַיַּעֲדֵי - because the text has - וַיֵּשֶׁא מִעֲלֵיךְ -
  
15. See further this Section, ch.7, Rejection of Onkelos' Translations.
  
16. See Sforino; Rabbi Samuel Ben Meir; S. Luzzatto, p.169.
  
17. Nahmanides explains that - קוֹמָן - should be taken  
 in the sense of - גוֹמָן - (The - ק' and - ג' inter-  
 changing) - "hole" in the ground, ( חֲפִירָה ) hence,  
 "storehouses". Rab. Saadia Gaon, p. 44 - translates  
 - לְקַמְצִים - מֵלֵךְ הַחוּצָרוֹת -
  
18. Neofiti follows Onkelos.

CHAPTER 3

19. Neofiti reads - ארום עמדי יאכלון גבריא באשון שירורבא -
20. - מתקרב - Ithp - to be chief, to lead, hence to assume superiority. See M. Jastrow, p.1446. See Nahmanides and Ibn Ezra.
21. cf. Neofiti. Ps. Jonathan reads - למתקפא עילן -
22. See Nahmanides. The Aramic word - למסתקפא - is from the root - סקף - perhaps to make go around, hence to turn against, seek occasion. cf. Lam.1<sup>22</sup> - ופולל -  
 - למו כאשר פולל לך. The Targum translates -  
 - וסתקף להון היבמא למסתקפת עילי. See *Supra*, this section, ch 2 note 6.
23. (Is.51<sup>18</sup>) - וינהלם - כמו וינהגם ויזמחלו אין מנהל לה -  
 It is similar to EX.15<sup>13</sup> - נהלת בעוך - "thou hast conducted them". With regard to the difficulty of this word - נהלת - See A. Geiger, *Hamikra ve-Targumav*, p.302. The Samaritan text reads - נמלל - with  
 - ח' - . Perhaps this is also the reading of Ps. Jonathan  
 - ומחטנת יתהון -

## NOTES

## CHAPTER 3

- (both "dug")
24. cf. LXX; The Vulgate, The N.E.B. is doubtful about its exact meaning and offers two meanings, a) "Bury me in the grave that I bought", b) Or that "I dug". Rab. Saadia Gaon, p.48 takes it as Rashi. Perhaps Onkelos was influenced by Ps. 40<sup>7</sup> where נָדַד - might be better translated "prepared" than "dug".
25. See J. Komlosh, p.144; S. Luzzatto, p.206; Bab.Tal.Sot.13<sup>a</sup> - אמר רבי יוחנן משום רבי שמעון בן יהוצדק אין בירה חלה - לשון מכירה שכן בכרכי הים קורין למכירה בירה. cf. Bab.Tal.Rosh-Hash.26<sup>a</sup>.
26. See Section, Veneration and Idealization of the Patriarchs, Group 1.
27. cf. Rashi GEN.6<sup>6</sup>; Rashi EX.13<sup>17</sup>. See this Section, ch.2, note 2, on the various explanations on the verb - נָחַם. The N.E.B. reads: "The people may change their minds".
28. Neofiti also translates freely - ולא יתבר לבהון - In EX.4<sup>6</sup> - Onkelos translates - מצרעת כשלג - "his (Moses) hand was leprous" - by וגם ידו חורא כתלגא - his hand was as white as snow. Onkelos was not exact for he omitted to translate the word "leprous".

781  
NOTES  
CHAPTER 3

29. cf. Onkelos GEN.25<sup>27</sup> - where - לְמִקְדָּשׁ - is taken as a House of Instruction.
30. cf. EX.29<sup>44</sup>; EX.30<sup>36</sup>; EX.31<sup>7</sup>.
31. cf. Ps. Jonathan. Neofiti reads - מִשְׁכַּן זֶמֶן -
32. cf. NUM.13<sup>2</sup>; NUM.13<sup>22</sup>; NUM.13<sup>21</sup>; NUM.13<sup>25</sup>; NUM.14<sup>6</sup>; NUM.14<sup>34</sup>; NUM.14<sup>36</sup>.
33. Rashi's source is the Siphre. cf. also The Palest. Tal.Shek.6,1; Midrash Hagadol, NUM.pp.153-154. See this Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch.4, note 12.
34. Rashi quotes this midrashic interpretation in the name of the Siphre.
35. See Section, Veneration and Idealization of the People of Israel, Group D, See S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, Munich, 1888, p.213 - עַמּוּן עֵינֶיךָ לְעִין מִסִּירָה בְּאִנְשֵׁי צִבְיָה -  
Rab. Saadia Gaon, p.130 explains - וְיִמְסְרוּ - נִבְקְרוּ וְנִבְרְרוּ -
36. Neofiti translates - וְאֶרְבֵּי חֵילוֹ - by - וְיִמְסְרוּ -

CHAPTER 3

37. B.Z. Berkovitz - חליפות שמלות - p.122-explains Onkelos differently. J. Komlosch, p.146 explains as follows:-  
- תרגום אונקלוס הסתייג מלהשתמש בקשר לבט אדם בשורש "כתת", שהוא מתאים יותר לחפצים כגון לשמן ומשום כך השתמש בפעל טרד שכוון יפה גם לבט אדם.
38. Ps. Jonathan reads - וקחו ירכון
39. Ps. Jonathan translates - לא מכסיא -Neofiti  
reads - לא כסיר -
40. See chapters, Anthropomorphisms; this Section, ch.7, Rejection of Onkelos' Targum, note 13.
41. - כתרגומן כסבורים הם ששכחתי מעשיהם כולם  
גנובים ושקורים לפי -  
See Rabbi M. Ben Eliyahu's Commentary on DEUT.p.188; Ibn Ezra.
42. Quite often Nahmanides remarked that Onkelos translates freely. See M. Levenstein, Nephesh Hager. Introduction, p.22, para. 3.



NOTESCHAPTER 4 - TRANSLATION OF BIBLICAL IDIOMS INTO ARAMAIC

1. It is also possible to say that Onkelos did not translate literally in order to avoid the anthropomorphism. See Section, Anthropomorphism, Group A, Motion and Place Denied God, note 5.
2. cf. Onkelos NUM.13<sup>20</sup> - השמנה היא אם רזה - see S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. p.2.
3. See Halachic Section, Group C, note 6.
4. cf. Rashi EX.21<sup>18</sup>; EX.22<sup>2</sup>.
5. cf. Onkelos EX.14<sup>8</sup> - ביד רמה ; NUM.14<sup>24</sup> - וימלא אחריו -
6. See General Introduction, p.22f , Section, Anthropomorphism Group E, Reference to Human Senses, note 4.
7. See the full text of Rashi.
8. The verb - חגר - "to gird" - sometimes is translated by - נקדן - as in DEUT.1<sup>41</sup>; EX.29<sup>9</sup>; LEV.8<sup>7</sup>; LEV.8<sup>13</sup> - and sometimes by - רסר - "to tie", "to chain", as in LEV.16<sup>4</sup>;

## 8. (cont'd)

EX.12<sup>11</sup>. In other words it all depended on the context of the text and subject matter. In battle, the verb - **לָחַם** - is more appropriate, whilst in the wearing of garments the verb - **לָבַשׁ** - is more appropriate. cf. Jonathan, Is.15<sup>3</sup>; Is.22<sup>12</sup>; Is.32<sup>11</sup>, Ez.7<sup>18</sup>; Ez.27<sup>31</sup>. In the Hagiographa, Lam.2<sup>10</sup> - **לָבַשׁוּ עֲקִיב** - is translated by - **קָמְרוּ סִקִּין** -

9. See Onkelos DEUT.1<sup>24</sup> where he translates also - **לָבַשׁוּ** - by - **לָבַשׁוּ יְרֵכָה** - see this Section, ch.3, Free Translation, note 15, General Introduction, p. 30 f.

NOTESCHAPTER 5 - INJECTION OF "DERASH" AND "HALACHA"IN ONKELOS' TARGUM

1. See Bab.Tal.Pes.54<sup>a</sup> - שבקה דברים נבראו קודם שנברא העולם -  
 יאלו קן תורה ותשובה וגן ערן וגיהנם ונסא הכבוד ובית המקדש ושמואל  
 משיח.  
 cf. Bab.Tal.Ned.39<sup>b</sup>. cf. Tanhuma, Buber, Parashat Naso, 19,  
 p.34. Tanhuma adds - אבות העולם. cf. GEN. Rabbah 1,4;  
 Midrash on Prov. on ch.8<sup>9</sup>. See Nahmanides, Rabbi A. Ibn  
 Ezra and Rabbi D. Kimhi, p. 26.
2. - מקדם - אמר רבי שמואל בר נחמן את סבור קודם  
 לבריתו של עולם ואינו אלא קודם לאדם הראשון  
 אדם נברא בשש' גן ערן בשלישי וכד'...
3. See GEN. Rabbah, 44,14 - הראה לו ג' מיט פרים וג' מיט  
 עעירים וג' מיט אליהם וכד'...  
 Yalk. Shimoni, 247,77; Midrash Aggadah, Buber, v.1,  
 pp.32-33; Bab.Tal. Taan.27<sup>b</sup>; Meg.31<sup>b</sup>.
4. Rabbi David Kimhi in his Commentary on the Torah, p.91 -  
 rejects Ibn Ezra's interpretation, and accepts that of  
 Onkelos and Rashi. In his book - שורשים - שורש ג' -  
 however, he takes it to mean - שלישי לבטן - the  
 third child to his mother, (which is usually soft and  
 tender). See S. Luzzatto, p.70.

5. See Mechilta, Beshalach; (מסכתא ב. פתיחא). See Midrashic Section, Group A, note 17.
6. The Palest. Targum and Neofiti follow Onkelos. Ps. Jonathan, however, reads - וכל חר עת קמטא מפלין סליקו -
7. Beshalach, Parasha 6 (on EX.15<sup>8</sup>). See Bab.Tal.Sot, p.11<sup>a</sup>. See Midrashic Section, Group A, notes 20 and 21; this Section, ch.8, Rashi and Menachem Ben Seruk, note 4; A. Geiger, Hamikra ve-Targumav, p. 301.
8. cf. the second interpretation of the Mechilta, *ibid*. See Ginzberg, Legends, v.6, p.10.
9. See Mechilta, Mishpatim, Parasha 19; Bab.Tal.Tem.4<sup>a</sup>; Rashi and Nahmanides.
10. See Halachic Section, Group E, note 7; A. Geiger, Hamikra ve-Targumav, op.cit.p. 303.
11. See Mechilta Parasha 20; Mishna Pes.63<sup>a</sup>; Palest.Tal. ch.5, Halacha 4. Ps. Jonathan also translates in accordance with tradition.

787  
NOTES  
CHAPTER 5

12. See our Halachic Section, Group E, note 10.
13. - מוכס - is revenue farmer, publican, see M. Jastrow, p.741.
14. See Bab.Tal. Sheb.39<sup>a</sup>.
15. Neofiti translates - ובמטפמרה - by - ובזרעיה -
16. See A. Geiger, Jüdische Zeitschrift, 9,1871, p.91.  
A. Berliner, in his book Targum Onkelos, p.119, however,  
disagrees with Geiger. See J. Komlosh, p.151, note 103.
17. See Bab.Tal.Hul.78<sup>b</sup> (the argument between the Sages and  
Rabbi Hananiah); Halachic Section, Group E, note 20.
18. cf. Ps. Jonathan - יתה' ו'ת גרה
19. See Bab.Tal.Sanh.78<sup>b</sup>; Siphra and Rashi LEV.24<sup>12</sup>. cf. the  
Palest. Targumim.
20. See Siphre, Haazinu, Piska 306; Midrash Tannaim.

788  
NOTES  
CHAPTER 5

21. See S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, p.272 - who suggests that Onkelos understood - יֵרֵב - as - יֵרֶב (בְּחִלּוֹף) - "pleasant". *This could mean that Onkelos is independent of the exegesis in the Siphre; but it seems unlikely.*
22. See Siphre Piska 306; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. pp.690-691.
23. See further this Section, ch.7, Rejection of Onkelos' Translations.
24. cf. Rab. Saadia Gaon (ed.Kafih) p.151 - יֵרֶב = יֵרֵב; Ibn Ezra.
25. See Siphre, Haazinu, Piska, 322.
26. See this Section, ch.9, Onkelos and Hebrew Grammar, note 2.
27. cf. Rab. Saadia Gaon, p.152; Nahmanides and Rabbi D. Kimhi, p.287.
28. cf. S. Luzzatto on the Torah, p.562 - מְכַרֵּת פֶּתַח -  
מְכַרֵּת הַנְּטָחִים -  
cf. A. Ibn Ezra; M.D. Cassuto, v.3, p.113 -  
מְכַרֵּת - מְכַרֵּת הַפְּעִיל מְכַרֵּת מֵת פֶּתַח הַשֵּׁם, כְּלָמָה  
מְכַרֵּת מֵת הַכֵּל.

789  
NOTES  
CHAPTER 5

29. See GEN.4<sup>16</sup> where Onkelos translates - בארץ נוד - Midrashically; S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, p.221; Onkelos and Rashi, GEN.14<sup>3</sup> s.v - עמק הערבים; GEN.16<sup>14</sup> s.v - באר לך ראי.
30. cf. GEN. Rabbah, 58,8.
31. cf. Bab.Tal.Shab.33<sup>b</sup>; N.E.B. "Jacob came safely to the city of Shechem etc." See Cassuto, p.126. See further this Group, note 24.
32. See Bab.Tal.Taan 9<sup>a</sup>; Tanh. Parashat Hukat,21; Tanh.Buber, Hukat, p.64,47. These geographical place names are interpreted differently in the Bab.Tal. Irub. 54<sup>a</sup>. cf. Ethics of the Fathers, ch.6. Mishna 2; Bab.Tal.Ned.55<sup>a</sup>.
33. The incident of the quails occurred in Kibroth Hattaavah, and not in Hazeroth as Onkelos interprets. Perhaps the connection is because the two places were very near each other, as can be seen from verse 35, and most likely the incident occurred on the border of both places. See S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, p.221; Midrashic Section, Group C, note 50.

CHAPTER 5

34. See Siphre, Bemidbar, Piska, 134, Siphre Debarim, Piska, 6 - ואין לבנון אלא בית המקדש. למה קורין אותו לבנון מפני שמלבין עוונותיהם על ישראל - cf. Siphre ibid. Piska, 28; Bab. Tal. Yoma 39<sup>a</sup>; Bab. Tal. Git. 56<sup>b</sup>: - אברהם מלכא את, דאי לאו מלכא את לא - מיסכרא ירושלים בדרך דכתיב והלבנון באדיר יפול ונד. ואין לבנון אלא בית המקדש שנאמר ההר השוב הנה והלבנון.
35. See M.D. Cassuto: - ערך אררט במקרא, מנצקלופדיה מקראית - v.1, pp.745-746; J. Komlosch, p.222; L. Ginzberg, Legends, v.5, p.186. Ps. Jonathan also reads: - שוורי דקדרון -
36. In Bab. Tal. Ber. 26<sup>b</sup> the reading is - קפ/דקיא - cf. Jonathan and Palest. Targum and Neofiti. See N. Adler, Netinah-Lager.
37. In fact GEN. 11<sup>9</sup> support their theory. cf. Ps. Jonathan.
38. See (supra) this Group, note 14.
39. See N. Adler, Netinah-Lager; cf. also Ps. Jonathan and LXX.



791  
NOTES  
CHAPTER 5

40. cf. Ps. Jonathan. See NUM.20<sup>1</sup>; NUM.20<sup>14</sup>.
41. Rashi NUM.21<sup>28</sup> follows Onkelos.
42. In NUM.32<sup>3</sup> Onkelos identifies - עֲמֻרֹת וְדִבּוֹן - by  
- מִכָּל לֵדָה וּמִלְבָּעֵרָה - . Most likely this is an inter-  
polation by a later writer taken from Ps. Jonathan's  
Targum for in Bab.Tal.Ber.8<sup>b</sup> Rashi says clearly that there  
is no Targum to - עֲמֻרֹת וְדִבּוֹן - In fact, in verses  
34, 35, 36,37 and 38 Onkelos offers no Targum to these  
two places. See N. Adler, Netinah-Lager; S. Luzzatto,  
Oheb-Ger. p.71.
43. See N. Adler, Netinah-Lager.
44. cf. Onkelos, GEN.9<sup>9</sup>; NUM.14<sup>25</sup>. See G. Vermes Haggadah  
in Onkelos' Targum, J.S.S. v.8, p.160.
45. cf. Rashi GEN.37<sup>25</sup> - לָמָּה פִּרְסַם הַכְּתוּב אֶת מַעֲשֵׂאֵי ?  
לְהַדִּיעַ מֵתֵן. . . שֶׁאֵין דְּרוֹכָן שֶׁל עֶרְבִי"ם לְשֵׁמֶת  
אֵלֶּה נִפְשָׁם. . . .

## NOTES

CHAPTER 6 - THE INFLUENCE OF ARAMAIC LANGUAGE ON THE HEBREW

1. The Torah itself contains one Aramaic phrase. See GEN.31<sup>47</sup>  
 See P. Churgin-השפעת הארמית על העברית אנקלוס' מקראית -  
 v.1, 1965, p. 593; Isaac Avinery - השפעת הארמית  
 על העברית ; לעוננו טסן תרצ"א  
 this Section, ch.1,  
 Rashi's Use of Onkelos' Targum with regard to Nouns and  
 Verbs, notes 11 and 12.
  
2. For Rashi,  
 Aramaic - <sup>Possibly</sup> חבך - corresponds to Hebrew - חבך. On the verb  
 - חבך - see B.D.B. p.7, cf. Ethics of the Fathers, 1,4  
 - והו' מתאבק בעפר רגליו - Onkelos, however, may  
 have taken - חבך - from - חבך - "dust". (See Menachem,  
 quoted by Rashi) - become dusty [ in - wrestling ] -  
 which is paraphrased by Onkelos - ואשתדך -  
 See this Section, ch.3, Free Translation.
  
3. Rashi appears to take - נצץ - from - נצץ - shrunk,  
 withered. See M. Jastrow, v.2, p. 927; Rabbi E. Mizrahi;  
 Nahmanides, who argues with Rashi.
  
4. Some editions read in Rashi - רך בלשון רומי מלך -  
 i.e. in Latin - רך - means "Rex" - King.

793  
NOTES  
CHAPTER 6

5. See Siphre, Devarim, Piska 1; GEN. Rabbah 90,3; Midrash Aggadah, Buber, v.1, p. 97; Lekah-Tov; Midrash Hagadol, GEN, p. 713.
6. cf. The Palest. Targum. Neofiti reads:- י'מ' אבוי  
דמלכא דרב בחכמתא וועיר בעפר ורכיך בעטנה
7. A. Geiger, Hamikra ve-Targumav, p.300 — suggests that Onkelos accepted the interpretation of Ps. Jonathan and the Palest. Targum, but he merely avoids the usual elaboration of the other Targumim and retains only the beginning of their interpretation:- אונקלוס קבל את  
הפירוש הזה אלא שהוא משמיט את הרחבת דברי  
העקיפין [של תרגום יונתן] ומשאיר רק את ההתחלה  
אבא למלכא.

See G. Vermes, J.S.S. v.8, 1963, p.162. Rab. Saadia Gaon, p.42, takes it to mean - ארטרף - "prince".

8. The word - אפריון - is an obscure word and probably a Greek word "phoreion" = litter, carrying chair. cf. Song.3<sup>9</sup> - אפריון עטה לו המלך שלמה - cf. Bab.Sot.12<sup>a</sup> - הושיבה (יוכבד) באפריון ואהרן ומרים מרקרין לפניה -  
It may, however, be a semitic word and it means a "headscarf". See M.D. Cassuto, Song.p.20.

794  
NOTES  
CHAPTER 6

9. With regard to the explanation of these words - עדים -  
ורחם - See S. Luzzatto in his commentary on the Torah,  
p.203; Midrashic Section, Group B, note 10.
10. Rashi - בבקר יאכל עד- לשון בזה ושלל המתרגם עדמה -
11. Rashi DEUT.11<sup>14</sup> believes that the Hebrew word - ומלקוש -  
has its origin in Aramaic.
12. The word - עד - here is a good case where Hebrew - עד  
is a genuinely Hebrew heritage parallel to Aramaic  
- עדמה. Rashi may have wanted to make it an Aramaism  
in Hebrew because of the existence of the other Hebrew  
- עד - "until".
13. cf. Onkelos GEN.34<sup>14</sup> . Nahmanides argues with Rashi.
14. cf. this Section, ch.1, Rashi's Use of Onkelos' Targum  
with regard to Nouns and Verbs, note 39; this Section,  
ch.7, Rejection of Onkelos' Targum, note 14; General  
Introduction, p.36, footnote 106.

NOTESCHAPTER 7 - REJECTION OF ONKELOS' TRANSLATION

1. See General Introduction, p.21 this Section, ch.3, Free Translation, notes 6, 7, 8, 18. Also, ch.5, Injection of Halachic and Midrashic Interpretations, notes, 1, 4, 10 and 11.
2. cf. GEN.50<sup>17</sup> - שא נא פשע אחיך
3. Ed. Kafih, p.18. cf. Ibn Ezra and Nahmanides.
4. cf. the Palest. Targum and Neofiti.
5. See Bab. Tal. Hul. 7<sup>b</sup>; GEN. Rabbah Parasha 82,15; Ps. Jonathan.
6. cf. DEUT.2<sup>10</sup> - Onkelos takes - א'מים - in the sense of - גבר'א -
7. See S. Luzzatto in his Commentary on the Torah, p.145, who quotes some scholars who read - הוא ענה אשר - מצא את החמין. In other words Anah found[springs of] "hot water". cf. the Vulgate "aqua calidas".

8. cf. Rashi GEN.43<sup>3</sup> s.v - לא ידראו פנ -
9. Rashi's criticism of Onkelos is not justified for in actual fact - בדקא לארץ - could mean [point of potential] breach, i.e. entry into the land. By translating freely Onkelos is eliminating the Hebrew idiom. cf. ch. 3, Free Translation.
10. See Luzzatto Oheb-Ger. p. 45 - ש"ע - is frequently used for - בלח - plus infinitive e.g. GEN.17<sup>22</sup>, see Levy's Targum Lexicon, p. 476. See this Section, ch.10, Rashi and the Text of Onkelos, note 16.
11. cf. Rab. Saadia Gaon, p.47; Rabbi D. Kimhi, p.204 offers a few interpretations to this particular word. See GEN. Rabbah, 98, 5 - ועקרתיו שורן של גרים - Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p.839, however, reads "שורן של גוים" - See Midrashic Section, Group E (e) Rashi and Derash, note 6. Also, ch. Rashi and Ps. Jonathan's Targum note 11.
12. The Palest. Targum reads: - וברצותיהון ובני יוסף אחיהון דמתיל לתורא - Onkelos - שור - "wall" is perhaps due to the fact that - עקר - means literally "uproot" a metaphor more appropriate to a wall than <sup>an</sup> animal's legs.

797  
NOTES  
CHAPTER 7

13. cf. Rab. Saadia Gaon, p.49 - ער' מס'ם -  
ממונים להשפילם ולבזותם -
14. See S. Luzzatto in his Commentary on the Torah, p.212.
15. Rashi does not accept that the stem of - ער' - is a trilateral basis - ער' - but rather - ער - "poor" - as its basic stem. However, <sup>regarding</sup> the verb "to inherit" he accepts that it is from - ער'. One fails, however, to understand why he does not accept the verb - ער' - as meaning - "poor" - since in GEN.45<sup>11</sup> he translates the Niphal form - ער' - according to Onkelos - רתמסכן - "impoverished". With regard to the treatment of weak verbs by Rashi, see J.P. Mendoza, Rashi as Philologist, pp. 26-32.
16. In the last two references Rashi quotes Onkelos as a support that the verb denotes "driving out". However, in NUM.14<sup>12</sup> other editions of the Targum read - ואשצינו - See N. Adler, Netinah-Lager. Also in NUM.14<sup>24</sup> other editions of the Targum read - ובנה' "ררנו" - (not like Rashi). See S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger, p.67; Also this Section, ch.10, Rashi and the Text of Onkelos, note 33.

798  
NOTES  
CHAPTER 7

17. Onkelos is obviously influenced by EX.5<sup>4</sup> for he translates..... תבשולון - by - תפריעו את העם
18. cf. Rabbi A. Ibn Ezra and Rabbi D. Kimhi, p. 234.
19. In EX.8<sup>18</sup> - והפליתי ביום ההוא - Ps. Jonathan translates - ואעביר בלאין בומא ההוא - He takes it in the sense of - פלא. Onkelos, however, translates - ואפר - See Rabbi D. Kimhi, p.215. With regard to our text, EX.33<sup>16</sup>, see S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, p.119; this Section, ch. 1, Rashi's Use of Onkelos' Targum with regard to Nouns and Verbs, note 4.
20. cf. Ibn Ezra; Rabbi S. Ben Meir; Sforino; Rab. Saadia Gaon, p. 128.
21. cf. Ps. Jonathan - ויקום שליט מדבית יעקב  
Palest. Targum - עתיד מלך למיקם  
Neofiti reads - עתיד מלך למיקם
22. See S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, p. 215.
23. See S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger, pp.80-81; Onkelos and Ps. Jonathan, DEUT.24<sup>7</sup>.



799  
NOTES  
CHAPTER 7

24. See Nahmanides who elaborates on these two interpretations; Rabbi Isaiah Berlin, Mine-Targuma, pp.32-33 quotes Maimonides and the Mishna Sanh. p. 85<sup>a</sup>.
25. See this Section, ch. 3, Free Translation, note 19. See chapters, Anthropomorphisms.
26. Rashi - מו' רעב - אונקלוס תרגם נפיו' כפן, ואין לי ער מוכיח  
גליו -
27. See this Section, ch. 6, The Influence of Aramaic Language on the Hebrew, note 14. Also ch.1, Rashi's Use of Onkelos' Targum with regard to Nouns and Verbs, note 39.
28. With regard to the large number of words to render - נחם - see Raphael Loewe, "Jerome's Treatment of an Anthropomorphism" Vetus Testamentum, pp.261-272. See this Section, ch.2, Rashi's Use of the Targum without Identifying Onkelos, note 2. Also Section, Anthropomorphisms, Group C, References to Human Emotions, note 1.

800  
NOTES  
CHAPTER 7

29. See GEN.19<sup>15</sup> - where Rashi translates - בן תספרה -  
literally - דעה'ה בלח - and not like Onkelos who  
renders - דלמא תלקי . cf. Onkelos NUM.16<sup>26</sup>. See  
this Section, ch.3, Free Translation.
30. See Rashi GEN.25<sup>3</sup>; GEN.18<sup>19</sup>; GEN.20<sup>13</sup>; GEN.43<sup>18</sup>.
31. See Rashi GEN.15<sup>11</sup>; EX.10<sup>21</sup>; EX.15<sup>13</sup>.

NOTESCHAPTER 8 - RASHI AND MENACHEM BEN SERUK

1. Menachem Ben Jacob, the Spaniard, of the family Seruk, was born in Tortosa and lived in Cordova about 960 A.D. with the celebrated Minister, Ḥasdai Ibn Shaprut. He was the author of the Maḥberet one of the first complete lexicons of the biblical language. He arranged all the biblical Hebrew words into a lexicographical order, and thereby compiled the first Hebrew dictionary. Menachem's lexicon is based on biliteral units expanding where appropriate into 3- letter stems, rather than on the triliteral root recognised by subsequent Hebrew Grammarians. Generally, his style is brief but <sup>he</sup>endeavours to analyse difficult and obscure words with the result that quite often he displays new ideas. One of his severe critics was Dunash-Ben-Labrat (quoted also by Rashi) of Fez, a contemporary of Menachem, who made severe comments on Menachem's Maḥberet. See S.D. Luzzatto in Kerem Chemed, p.48; Herschell Filipowski, The First Hebrew and Chaldaic Lexicon by Menachem Ben Seruk, London, 1854.

2. Rashi:- ובהעטיף - לשון אימור כתר גומו, ובלקישות. ומנחם  
חברו עם המחלצות והמעטפות לשון עטיפת כסות  
כלומר מעטפות בעורן וצמרן ואינן מתאווה  
להתייחס על ידי הזכרים.

802  
NOTES  
CHAPTER 8

3. cf. (DEUT. 11<sup>14</sup>) - מלקוש - the "latter" rain. Also  
Amos 7<sup>1</sup> - לַקֵּשׁ
4. cf. EX. 9<sup>33</sup> - where Rashi favours Menachem's interpretation:-  
לא נידך - ומנחם בן סרוק מברו בחלק כדתוך כסף  
... ורואה את דבריו כתרגומו ו'צק.
5. cf. - ערום - GEN. 3<sup>1</sup>; Midrashic Section, Group A,  
note 20.
6. Rashi - נערמו - אונקלוס תרגם לשון ערמימות. ולשון צמור -  
המקרא כמו ערימת חטים, ונצבו כמו נד יובים.
- The second interpretation is from Menachem. See his  
Mahberet, ed. Herschell Filipowski, London, 1954, p. 138.
7. See this Section, ch. 5, Injection of Derash and Halacha in  
Onkelos' Targum, note 4. See DEUT. 7<sup>13</sup> - עשרת דורות -  
where Rashi follows Menachem. See this Section, ch. 1, note 33.
8. See Rashi, LEV. 11<sup>3</sup> s.v - גרה - See J.P. Mendoza,  
Rashi as Philologist, p. 65.

9. Rashi - ואבן מעבית - לשון כיסוי כמו ושכתי כפי שמכסין הקרקע ברצפת אבנים.

This also is taken from Menachem's Mahberet, p.173.

Rashi is incorrect as the form - מעביר - shows (impossible from a root - שכך). It is from - שכה // סכי - to look at, gaze in admiration. cf. Is.2<sup>16</sup> - שכור -

In Aramaic - (or סכה) cf. סכי. הקמדה. Onkelos, GEN.15<sup>5</sup> (by - סכי - אמר רבי יצחק יסכה זו שרה... ולמה נקרא אצמה... שסבתה ברוח הקדש... לא יסכה - שדה כל סוכן ביופה.... cf. Bab.Sanh.97<sup>b</sup>; Ket. 62<sup>b</sup>).

10. cf. GEN.18<sup>10</sup> where Rashi translates - בעת מיר - by - לשנה הבאה - "next year". Again Menachem originated this explanation, see Mahberet, p.87. cf. GEN.41<sup>43</sup> - Rashi, in the name of Rabbi Jose-Ben-Durmaskit (the son of a woman of Damascus) explains the unusual word - אברך - with - ברכים - "knees". Menachem likewise connects the two and takes the - א' - of - אברך - as prophetic, as in - מצודה - see Mahberet, p.14; see GESENIUS, ch.II,19, M. p.70.

11. These terms are obscure and generally speaking Africa is taken as a district in North Africa, and Kapti as the coptic language. For further information, see Kohut's Aruch, s.v - מ -

12. Similarly, Rashi rejects the Rabbi's interpretation and accepts that of Dunash-Ben-Labrat, e.g. NUM.11<sup>8</sup> s.v -  
לעד העמך -
13. It may be worth mentioning that although Rashi challenges Menachem's derivations yet, throughout his commentary, he has never shared Dunash-Ben-Labrat's claim that certain definitions of Menachem were likely to lead the reader to erroneous interpretations of Halacha and belief. As a matter of fact Rashi's grandson, the famous Tosafist, Rabbi Jacob Ben Meir, (known as Rabbenu Tam) in his book of decisions (appended to the Filipowski's edition of the Mahberet) defended Menachem from Dunash's criticisms and proved that his decisions were valid. See Joshua Blau, Encyclopaedia Judaica, Keter, 1974, v.11, p.1305; H. Filipowski, ibid. in his Introduction, p.14.
14. Rashi quotes Onkelos who takes it in the sense of "prayer" - ואוקלוס תרגם לשון תפלה [קביל ה' בעיותי] -  
בא תחנונותי בצלותי  
See section, Veneration, Group A note 3.
15. See Rashi GEN.41<sup>34</sup> s.v - וחמץ - . See J.P. Mendoza, Rashi as Philologist, p. 66.

16. See Mahberet, op.cit. p. 95 - לא יחרץ כלב לשונו -  
פתרונו לפי קטנו לשון הנקה, לא ינוץ כלב לשונו.
17. See EX.3<sup>22</sup> - ונצלרתה - where Rashi rejects Menachem's derivation.
18. It is, of course, an "ex-post facto" etymology for - משה; if it were the real etymology the name would have to be - משהי (cf. Ibn Ezra). In fact it is Egyptian for "son" (mesu) - she called him (her) son. (cf. Rameses - son of Ra, Totmes etc, borne by Kings of Egypt).

NOTESCHAPTER 9 - ONKELOS AND HEBREW GRAMMAR

Known as Abu-al Walid. See the Introduction of this Section, Rashi as Philologist.

2. Naturally Rashi assumed (as we today would not invariably assume) that Onkelos had before him the Massoretically vocalised text, i.e. - וְדַמְרִי - vocalised - וְדַמְרִי; and thus excluding the possibility of reading it - וְדַמְרִי!
3. cf. EX.14<sup>24</sup>; Jud. 4<sup>15</sup>. See this Section, ch.10, Rashi and the Text of Onkelos, note 27.
4. Rashi compares it to - וְדַמְרִי - the second - וְ - receives a dagesh because it comes in place of two - וְ - since the word requires three - וְ - two for the root (דַּמְרִי) and the third as a servile letter. Rashi, here, follows Menachem-Ben-Seruk who recognises the stem of וְדַמְרִי - as biliteral (דַּמְרִי) basis. cf. Rashi EX.29<sup>1</sup>. See J.P. Mendoza, Rashi as Philologist, p.18.
5. cf. also NUM.20<sup>29</sup> s.v - כִּי אָזַע ; DEUT.12<sup>30</sup> s.v - תִּנְקֶשׁ - where Rashi rejects Onkelos' Targum as his explanations are not in accordance with the rules of Hebrew Grammar. cf. Rashi and Onkelos, NUM.35<sup>32</sup> s.v - לָנוּס . See S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, pp.219-220. See this Section, ch.5, Injection of Derash and Halacha in Onkelos' Targum, note 11.



6. See A.S. Silbermann The Pentateuch with Rashi's Commentary EX.p.219, Appendix 3. Rashi sees that - ירא-ה - cannot be treated as - ירא-ה - in the way that the Targum does without leaving the following - ושב - without a subject other than the Deity (mentioned at the beginning of the verse, but desiderated again if - ירא-ה - had intervened).
7. Rashi obviously assumes - rightly - that - מרחמי - is an ettaphal form, corresponding to "Hophal", which must be vocalised - מרחמי , as opposed to - מרחמי - etc., of the popular editions (ethpe'el).
8. cf. Rashi.EX.33<sup>9</sup> - With the aid of the Targum in GEN.29<sup>8</sup> s.v - וגלגל - he ascertains the function of the respective tense. With regard to the tenses, see J.P. Mendoza, op. cit. p. 41.
9. Other editions in the Targum read - וכנא . See Rabbi E. Mizrahi. It is interesting to note that in DEUT.4<sup>10</sup> Rashi does not comment on Onkelos who translates - הקהל - by - כנוא קדמי - and not by - מכנא . Perhaps here, too, Rashi would read in the Targum - מכנא . See this Section, ch.10, Rashi and the Text of Onkelos, note 30.

CHAPTER 9

10. With the aid of Onkelos who translates GEN.49<sup>23</sup> יִרְבֹּן -  
by - וְנִקְמָה - Rashi explains the passive force  
of the Niphal.
11. See S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, p. 199 - who  
suggests that Onkelos is in agreement with Rashi,  
Ps. Jonathan does not take it as a noun:-  
- הלאי דמיתנא כד מיתנו אחנא -
12. - ותמין את הילדים - מספקות להם מזון תרגום  
הראשון יקדמא, והשני יקדמיון לפי שלשון עבר וכו'.
13. - לין עש דבר, והיא אמרה ללון כמה לינור - Rashi  
See GEN. Rabbah, 60, 6.
14. His Commentary on the Torah, p.129; cf. Ibn Ezra.

NOTESCHAPTER 10 - RASHI AND THE TEXT OF ONKELOS

1. The popularity of the Targum can be seen from the following statement of Rab. Shalom Gaon: - "שאר התרגומים אין בהם קדושה כתרגום זה, ושחקנו מפי חכמים קדמונים שעתן גדול עשה הקב"ה באונקלוס הגר על שנעשה התרגום על ידו, -  
See A. Berliner, Targum Onkelos, p. 172; J. Komlosh in his Introduction, pp. 33-35; Bab. Tal. Ber. 8<sup>b</sup>; Siphre, Piska 161 with regard to DEUT. 17<sup>19</sup>.  
"It is laid down in the Shulhan Aruch, V. Orach-Chaim, ch. 285 of the obligatory reading of the pentateuchal weekly portion - twice in the original Hebrew and once in Onkelos' Targum. See, - Introduction to this Section, Rashi as Philologist; General Introduction, p. 21 .
2. Targum Onkelos, (Second ed. Amsterdam 1896). He also believes that the two different cantillations of Babylon and Tiberias were the cause of the various versions which exist in Onkelos' Targum. See, J. Komlosh, *ibid*, p. 32.
3. Oheb-Ger, p. 85. Luzzatto made another 16 corrections in the Targum Onkelos.
4. A. Berliner - רש"י על התורה. 1905, p. 433. However, as Rashi did not write prefaces to his commentary or <sup>on</sup> the method to be pursued, it will be futile to make any rules as to what exactly Rashi meant by the different stylistic methods he has used

## NOTES

## CHAPTER 10

## 4. (cond'd)

in quoting Onkelos. In fact in GEN.41<sup>38</sup> s.v - הנמצא כזה - Rashi points to the correct rendering in the Targum without saying - ואונקלוס תרגם - or - ותרגמו - or - כתרגמו. (See this chapter, note 14) cf. Rashi EX.8<sup>20</sup> and this chapter, note 20; Rashi EX.16<sup>14</sup> and this chapter, note 22; Rashi EX.23<sup>5</sup> and this chapter, note 26; Rashi NUM.5<sup>2</sup> and this chapter, note 32. In other instances Rashi points to the correct reading in the Targum and states - ותרגמו - and not - כתרגמו - e.g. GEN.26<sup>22</sup> and this chapter, note 5; cf. LEV.25<sup>47</sup> and this chapter, note 31. In EX.34<sup>5</sup> Rashi corrects the reading by saying - ומתרגמין - and not - ותרגמו - (see this chapter, note 29).

Other Exegetes established certain rules about these terms of Rashi. See - מקראות גדולות - LEV, Vilna (שנת תרמ"ו) - 1886. Also LEV. ed. Levin-Epstein, Jerusalem (שנת תש"ד) 1954 - But as L. Zunz (Toledoth Rashi, p.3) has rightly remarked that these rules are incorrect and no attention should be paid to them. On this subject, see General Introduction, p. 32, Midrashic Section, Group A, note 7.

5. See Rashi GEN.49<sup>24</sup> - על דקים אוריתא בסתרא תוספת -  
הוא ולא מלשון עברי שבמקרא -  
See P. Churgin, Targum Jonathan to the Prophets, p.42,  
who believes that Onkelos' additions are due to the  
variety of translations which were inserted in the Targum  
at a later time by different editors.
6. See this Section, ch.5, Injection of "Derash" and "Halacha"  
in Onkelos' Targum.
7. See E.M. Lifshitz, Rashi, p.179.
8. In many editions the reading is - פגליא -
9. See Nahmanides; S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger, p.34, note 44,  
who quotes the various versions of the Targum; Sepher  
- יא" - (quoted by Luzzatto) reads as follows:-  
ורע" כדב ארי ידעתינה והמתרגם  
ארי גלי קדמי שועה הוא -  
See A. Sperber.
10. See A.M. Silbermann, The Pentateuch with Rashi's  
Commentary, GEN. p.80, note 1.

11. Rabbi A. Ibn Ezra and Rabbi S. Ben Meir agree with Rashi.  
*It is significant that the Neofiti Targum reads:*  
 - ארתי ומסר כר -
12. See A.M. Silbermann, The Pentateuch with Rashi's  
 Commentary, GEN. p. 121, note 1; N.Adler argues with  
 Rashi; See Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. p.39, note 66.
13. See Rabbi E. Mizrahi.
14. See A. Silbermann, The Pentateuch with Rashi's  
 Commentary, GEN. p.269. Appendix 1 p.134.
15. cf. Ps. Jonathan - ואמר מה דמיל - This is also  
 the reading in Neofiti.
16. See A. Berliner and A. Sperber.
17. See A. Berliner.
18. The wording of Rashi - ותרגום על אונקלוס - shows  
 clearly that Onkelos does not support him. On this  
 subject see S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. p.41, note 78. If  
 Rashi had in his Targum - אול - one would expect him  
 to say - כתרגומן -

813  
NOTES  
CHAPTER 10

19. See N. Adler, Netinah-Lager.
20. This is the translation of the Pentateuch, edited by J.H. Hertz, 2nd. ed. London Soncino Press, 1961. N.E.B. does not translate literally.
21. Ps. Jonathan reads - בגין כן אֵינִי לֵנָא - which is exactly Rashi's version. Perhaps when Rashi says - וְהַרְגוּם - not necessarily Onkelos is meant. cf. also GEN.41<sup>38</sup> - s.v - הַנְּמִצָּה - (supra, note 14) where Rashi reads as Ps. Jonathan. On this subject, see, ch. Rashi and Ps. Jonathan's Targum.
22. See S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. p. 45, note 102. S.B.Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, p.66; this Section, ch.7, Rejection of Onkelos' Translation, note 4.
23. N. Adler, Netinah-Lager suggests that Rashi had this reading in the Targum. Adler's reading in Rashi is incorrect for Rashi takes it from - הַמְּצָה - "half". In some editions, however, the word - בְּעָלִי - is not translated by the Targum. See A. Sperber and - פֶּסַח יֵאָר - p.14.

CHAPTER 10

24. Ps. Jonathan, The Palest. Targum and Neofiti take it in this sense.
25. This version is found in - פֶּר' י"א - EX. p.2. See S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger, p. 49, note 134.
26. - כָּבֵד - דִּרְגוֹמוֹ יָקִיר וְלֹא מִתִּיקָר כִּפְט עֲרֵדוֹא  
עַם דְּבַר וְכֹל --  
Rashi calls an adjective - עַם דְּבַר - which is the usual term for a noun.
27. See S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger: p.49, note 135; N. Adler, Netinah-Lager. Rabbi A. Ibn Ezra and Rabbi S. Ben Meir take it as a verb.
28. There are, however, different versions in Rashi's text. See S. Luzzatto Oheb-Ger. p.49, note 137. A.M. Silbermann, The Pentateuch with Rashi's Commentary, EX.p.37. Appendix 234, note 1.
29. N.E.B. reads: "But beware, there is trouble in store for you."



815  
NOTES  
CHAPTER 10

30. See Nahmanides - כִּי רָצָה - בְּתַרְגּוּמוֹ, וְהָ לָעוֹן רָצוֹ. וְמָה -  
טוֹב הָיָה שִׁפְרָשָׁהּ אֵלֵינוּ וְהַנוֹסְמָאוֹת מִן הַתַּרְגּוּם  
מִתְחַלְפוֹת בּוֹ יֵשׁ עֲכָרָוּב בְּהֵן וְכֹא...  
Nahmanides quotes three versions in connection with  
this Targum. See N. Adler, Netinah-Lager; S. Luzzatto,  
Oheb-Ger. p.49, note 139; A. Sperber.
31. See N. Adler, Netinah-Lager; S.B. Schefftel, Biure  
Onkelos, p.89; S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. p.52, note 155.
32. S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. p.52, note 159, reads - וְנִשְׁלַח יָדָהּ -  
See Section, Anthropomorphisms, Group A, Motion and  
Place Denied God, notes 24 and 25.
33. See N. Adler, Netinah-Lager.
34. See the different versions in S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. p.53,  
note 168; Tosafot, Bab.Tal.Kid.p.49; Halachic Section,  
Group C, note 4.
35. cf. Ps. Jonathan - וַאֲנִי עָמַד כָּל יְמֵי -
36. See S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. p.53, note 171; A. Sperber;  
S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, p.103. This Section, ch.9,  
Onkelos and Hebrew Grammar, note 1.

816  
NOTES  
CHAPTER 10

37. See S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. p.54, note 173.
38. See A.M. Silbermann, The Pentateuch with Rashi's Commentary, EX.p.192. Appendix 272, note 1; S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. p.561, note 187. Ps. Jonathan reads:-  
וקרא משה בשם מִימְרָא דִּדָּה' -
39. cf. NUM.16<sup>19</sup> where Onkelos translates - וִיקְרֵהָל by  
- וְאִכְנִישׁ. See this Section, ch.9, Onkelos and Hebrew Grammar, note 10.
40. See S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. p.56, note 189.
41. See also Rashi EX.40<sup>31</sup> s.v - וְרָחַצוּ
42. N.E.B's translation. J.H. Hertz' ed. (London Soncino Press, 1961) read - "And if a stranger who is a settler with thee etc".
43. The Siphra supports our editions:- גֵּר-הֵ"נּוּ גֵר צֶדֶק ,  
תְּנוּעָה זֶה גֵר אוֹכֵל נֶבֱלִיָּה -  
See N. Adler, Netinah-Lager; A. Sperber.

44. See the different versions in S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. p.64, note 243; A. Sperber; this Section, ch. 6, The Influence of Aramaic Language on the Hebrew, note 4.
45. See N. Adler, Netinah-Lager; Rashi NUM.14<sup>24</sup>; S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. p.67, note 262. See this Section, ch.7, Rejection of Onkelos' Targum, note 7.
46. cf. Rashi NUM.16<sup>18</sup>.
47. See N. Adler, Netinah-Lager; S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. p.78, note 369. Whilst Ps. Jonathan follows Onkelos -  
 - לתרע בית דינכון - Neofiti supports Rashi:-  
 - ותפקון ית גוברא קהוא או ית אתרבה ההיא  
 די עברו ית פתגמא ב'שה הדין לגו  
קור"בין וכא' - - -  
 See Halachic Section, Group C, note 7.

NOTES - INTRODUCTIONTHE ANTI-ANTHROPOMORPHISMS OF ONKELOS AND RASHI'S ATTITUDE

1. See Dahne, Religions-Philosophie, II, pp. 1-72, cf. also Freudenthal, Are there traces of Greek Philosophy in the Septuagint?, J.Q.R. II. pp.205-222, quoted by Charles T. Fritsch, The Anti-Anthropomorphisms of the Greek Pentateuch, pp. 3-4.
2. See Saadia Gaon, The Book of Doctrines and Beliefs (translated by A. Altmann) The Meaning of the Anthropomorphic Expressions in the Bible, ch.2, pp. 84-92.
3. cf. NUM.23<sup>19</sup> - לֹא אִישׁ אֶל וְיָנוּב וּבֶן אָדָם וַיִּתְנַחֵם -  
In GEN.3<sup>8</sup> - וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ אֶת קוֹל ה' מִתְהַלֵּךְ .... - The Torah deliberately mentions that Adam and Eve heard "the sound" (קוֹל) of the Lord God walking in the garden - but God himself was not walking. See M.D. Cassuto - מֵאֲדָם עַד נֹחַ - p. 100.
4. cf. EX.24<sup>16</sup>; cf. EX.24<sup>17</sup>; LEV.9<sup>6</sup>; LEV.9<sup>23</sup>; EX.33<sup>18</sup>; EX.40<sup>34</sup>; EX.40<sup>35</sup>; EZ.10<sup>18</sup>; EZ.1<sup>28</sup>; EZ. 8<sup>4</sup>. On the word "glory", see A. Geiger, Hamikra ve-Targumav, pp.205-207. It is not necessary in this context to consider the suggestion of whether the "Kebod" of God was assumed to manifest itself in an actually visible light, as has been argued to be the case regarding Ezekiel.

INTRODUCTION

5. DEUT.28<sup>10</sup>; LEV.24<sup>11</sup>; LEV.24<sup>16</sup>; GEN 16<sup>13</sup>.
6. Ch. T. Fritsch, op. cit. Introduction, p. 5.
7. Theologie,II. pp. 5-18. - quoted by Ch. T. Fritsch, *ibid*, p.5.
8. At this stage it is most important to note that the notion of intermediaries was highly developed by the Targumim, with their "Shechinah" (שכינה) or "word" (מילה) or Glory (קדש). See further about these uses by Targum Onkelos. Also this Section, Group A, Motion and Place Denied God. Also Group G, Intermediary Elements. Philo also developed his theory of the Logos.
9. cf. IS.6<sup>3</sup>; LEV.11<sup>45</sup>; LEV. 19<sup>2</sup>. On this subject of "Purity and Holiness" of God, see A. Marmorstein, The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God, pp.208-217.
10. The transcendent view of God can be seen from the Book of Ezekiel, ch.1, vv.26-28. Also ch.8<sup>2</sup>.
11. cf. EZ.1<sup>26</sup>; EZ.20<sup>33-34</sup>; IS.26<sup>11</sup>; IS.8<sup>11</sup>; IS.6<sup>1</sup>; ZECH.12<sup>4</sup>.

INTRODUCTION

12. Regarding Tikune Sopherim, see Mechilta -  $\text{אֲנִי־בְּשַׁלַּח}$  -  $\text{אֲנִי־בְּשַׁלַּח}$  - Beshalach, Parasha 6; GEN.Rabbah,49,7; EX. Rabbah,41,4; LEV. Rabbah,11,5; Tanh.16;Tanhuma, Buber, GEN.4; Palest. Tal.Bik.ch.3, Halacha 3; Rashi GEN.18<sup>22</sup>; Midrash Aggadah; Lekah-Tov; Siphre, Behaalotecha, Piska 84, Siphre, ibid, Piska,105; Yalk. Shimoni, Beshalach 247; Yalk. Psalms 806; Rashi,NUM.12<sup>12</sup>.
13. For a thorough study of Tikune Sopherim or Kinouye Sopherim, see A. Geiger, Hamikra ve-Targumav,pp.199-223 and especially pp.199-204; See also Ginzberg in his Introduction to the Hebrew Bible, pp.347-363; S.Lieberman, Hellenism in Jewish Palestine (1950) pp.28 ff.
14. See supra note 12; cf. also Midrash Hagadol,GEN.p.313.
15. cf. DEUT.1<sup>38</sup>; DEUT.10<sup>8</sup>.
16. See Rashi on this verse who states that the original reading was -  $\text{בְּרַעֲתָם}$  - And let me not see their evil. See, however, A. Berliner, Zechor le Abraham,who quotes Rashi in Job.32<sup>3</sup>, where he has the reading -  $\text{וְאֵלֶּיךָ}$  -  $\text{בְּרַעֲתָךְ}$  -

821  
NOTES  
INTRODUCTION

17. On the subject of Tikune Sopherim, see other suggestions by Luzzatto-quoted by A. Geiger, op. cit. p.218 - who believes that the Sopherim have also altered the vowels of a text, when they saw that the pointed text, as it stands, is unbecoming of the Deity, e.g. the phrase - 'לִקְרַאת אֵת פְּנֵי ה' (EX.34<sup>24</sup>) was originally in the Kal - לִקְרַאת - (as the inclusion of -קַר- shows) but because the original reading raises the obvious objection - "seeing the face of God" - the vowels were altered from the Kal to the Niphal. - לִקְרַאֲתִי. The passages in question are as follows:- EX.23<sup>15</sup>; EX.23<sup>17</sup>; EX.34<sup>20</sup>; EX.34<sup>23</sup>; DEUT.16<sup>16</sup>; DEUT.31<sup>11</sup>. On this subject see also Dillman, EX. p. 276; Driver, DEUT. International Critical Commentary, p. 198; Ch.T. Fritsch, op. cit. p.7.
18. cf. Guide to the Perplexed, v.1, ch.27-28. See E.Z.Melamed Mepharshe-Hamikra, v.1, p.150 ff.
19. cf. Onkelos, EX.19<sup>11</sup>; EX.19<sup>18</sup>; EX.19<sup>20</sup>; GEN.18<sup>21</sup>; EX.3<sup>8</sup>.
20. cf. Onkelos, GEN.1<sup>2</sup>; GEN.21<sup>17</sup>; GEN.31<sup>42</sup>; EX.12<sup>27</sup>; GEN.41<sup>16</sup>; GEN. 28<sup>17</sup>.
21. cf. Onkelos, GEN.28<sup>20</sup>; EX.19<sup>5</sup>; EX.17<sup>1</sup>; GEN.39<sup>21</sup>; GEN.39<sup>23</sup>; GEN.6<sup>6</sup>; EX.19<sup>7</sup>; DEUT.4<sup>37</sup>; DEUT.8<sup>3</sup>.

NOTESINTRODUCTION

22. GEN.17<sup>22</sup>; GEN.28<sup>13</sup>; GEN.28<sup>16</sup>. See R. Loewe, Jerome's Treatment of an Anthropopathism, Vetus Testamentum, Leiden, (E.J. Brill) 1952, v.II, p. 262.
23. See GEN.32<sup>30</sup> - כִּי רָאִיתִי אֱלֹהִים פָּנֶי- - "For I have seen God face to face" - Onkelos translates - אֱלֹהִי - מַלְאֲכֵי דְּרָה' - "For I have seen the Angel of the Lord". cf. Onkelos GEN.16<sup>14</sup>.
24. EX.33<sup>14</sup>; EX.34<sup>9</sup>; NUM.11<sup>20</sup>; NUM.35<sup>34</sup>; EX.25<sup>8</sup>; EX.20<sup>21</sup>; NUM.16<sup>3</sup>; NUM.5<sup>3</sup>.
25. See Maimonides, Guide to the Perplexed, ed. Kafih, v.1, ch.66 - who remarks that Onkelos' interpretation is very odd: - אֱלֹהִי אֱנוֹקְלוֹס הָרִי הֵלֶךְ בְּעֵטָן זֶה לְבֹאֹר מוֹפְלָא וּכְדָּ וְאֵינִי - "לֹדַע מֵהָ הַכְרִיחוֹ לֵכֵן וְהָיָה קֵל יוֹתֵר מִזֶּה, כְּתִיבִין בְּמִימְרֵי דְּרָה' - Ps. Jonathan translates literally.
26. cf. this Section, Group A, Motion and Place Denied God, notes 10 and 11. On this word - אֱלֹהִי - see Maimonides, Guide to the Perplexed, ibid, v.1, ch.27 and ch. 48. See, however, Nahmanides on GEN.46<sup>1</sup> who interprets Onkelos differently.



NOTESINTRODUCTION

27. See also EX.24<sup>11</sup> - לא עלה את ידו - where Onkelos avoids the anthropomorphism.
28. See this Section, Group B, References to Human Form and Organs, note 13.
29. cf. DEUT.4<sup>34</sup>; DEUT.5<sup>15</sup>; DEUT.7<sup>19</sup>; DEUT.26<sup>8</sup> - where the words - בְּיָד חֲזָקָה are translated by Onkelos literally - בִּידֵי רַקִּיפָא - "with a strong hand". The same applies to - בְּרִוּעַ נְטוּיָה - EX.6<sup>6</sup>; DEUT.9<sup>29</sup> - Onkelos translates literally - בִּדְרָעָא מְרֻמָּא - "with an upraised arm". See this Section, Group B, References to Human Form and Organs, note 12. S. Maybaum, Die Anthropomorphien, Breslaw, 1870, p.56, exaggerated in saying that Ps. Jonathan is more anti-anthropomorphic than Onkelos. This is not correct as in several instances Onkelos avoids the anthropomorphism of the text and Ps. Jonathan translates literally. See J. Komlosch, op. cit. p. 105, note 18.
30. LXX was also careful in translating - קִדְמֵי יְהוָה - "before the Lord". See Ch. T. Fritsch, op. cit. p.12; Ps. Jonathan was also careful in translating in all these cases - קִדְמֵי יְהוָה -

NOTESINTRODUCTION

31. See this Section, Group B, note 7. Nahmanides on GEN. 46<sup>1</sup>; S.D. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. Hametiv ha-Shelishi, p.3.
32. cf. EX.3<sup>7</sup>; EX.3<sup>9</sup>; EX.4<sup>31</sup>; EX.32<sup>9</sup>; DEUT.32<sup>19</sup>; DEUT.32<sup>36</sup>.
33. cf. GEN.6<sup>5</sup>; GEN.6<sup>12</sup>; GEN.29<sup>31</sup>; On the subtle distinction between the two translations of Onkelos - see Maimonides, Guide to the Perplexed, v.1, ch.48. See also Maimonides , ibid, about the verb - שמע - to hear.
34. See B.J. Roberts, The Old Testament Text and Versions, pp. 198-207.
35. See Halachic Section, Summary, suggestion 6.
36. See Ch.T. Fritsch, op. cit. p.20, who expresses a similar view about the translation of the Septuagint.
37. cf. Halachic Section, Summary, suggestion 4.
38. Rashi:- כיוצא בו כאריה יעמא, וכי מי נתן כח בארי מלא הוא -  
ונכתוב מעליו כאריה מלא אנו מכנים ומדמין אורכו

INTRODUCTION

38. (cont'd) - לבריותיו כדי לשבר את האון מה שיכולה לשמוע.  
 כיוצא בו וקולו בקול מים רבים. וכי מי נתן קול למים אלא  
 הוא ואיתה מכנה אותו לדמותו לבריותיו אלא לשבר  
 את האון -

cf. Mechilta, Jethro, Parasha 4.

39. cf. Rashi, EX.15<sup>8</sup>; EX.19<sup>4</sup>; EX.19<sup>19</sup>; EX.31<sup>17</sup> - where  
 this important rule is re-emphasized.

40. The heading under which some instances are classified  
 are subjective.

NOTESGROUP A - MOTION AND PLACE DENIED GOD

1. See Introduction - Anthropomorphism, footnote 8.
2. This is also the opinion of Maimonides that the term "Shechinah" is used as an intermediary, Nahmanides, GEN.46<sup>1</sup>, however, argues with him. It appears (as can be seen from this chapter) that Rashi holds like Maimonides. See M. Kadushin, Rabbinic Mind, p.223 ff. and 325 ff; J. Komlos, op. cit. p.107; G.Scholem, Mysticism, p.66 and p.226 f. See footnote 6.
3. cf. Rashi, EX.34<sup>9-10</sup> - וְנִחַלְכֵינוּ-שְׁלֹא תֵעָרָה שְׂכִינָתְךָ עַל הָאוֹמֹת - See this Section, Group G. Intermediary Elements, note 6.
4. See Midrashic Section, Group E (e) Rashi and Derash, note 8.
5. cf. Onkelos, EX.33<sup>15</sup>.
6. See A. Marmorstein; The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God, op. cit. pp. 103-104, note 87. Also this Section, Group G, Intermediary Elements, note 5; J. Abelson, The Immanence of God in Rabbinical Literature, London, 1912 - with regard to the term "Shechinah"; E.E. Urbach, The Sages, ch.3, pp. 29-52, with

## 6. (cont'd)

special reference to p.32. Rab. Saadia Gaon, in Book of Beliefs and Opinions, 2, 10 believes that the "Shechinah" is a created being which is separate from God. See S. Schechter, Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology, 1909, p.40, note 1. Encyclopaedia Judaica, Keter, v.14, pp.1349-1354.

7. However, in LEV.26<sup>24</sup> and LEV.26<sup>28</sup> - the word - והלכתי - is translated by Onkelos literally, although applied to God.

8. cf. Rashi GEN.6<sup>9</sup> - who interprets that Noah needed God's support:- נח היה צריך סעד לתמוכו

9. The Pentateuch with Rashi's Commentary.

10. cf. Onkelos, GEN.24<sup>40</sup> - אשר התהלכתי לפניו -  
 "The Eternal before whom I walk - די פלחית קדמוני -  
 "God before whom I worship". cf. also GEN.48<sup>15</sup> - התהלכו -  
 די פלחו אבהתי קדמוני - Onkelos translates - אבותי לפני -  
 ... - "The God before whom my fathers Abraham  
 and Isaac worshipped". When the verb - הלך - is in the  
 sense of - "The Eternal went before them" - (EX.13<sup>21</sup>;  
 DEUT.1<sup>30</sup>; DEUT.1<sup>33</sup>; DEUT.20<sup>4</sup>; DEUT.31<sup>6</sup>) then the  
 Targum Onkelos takes it in the sense of - נהג (גבר) -  
 - to lead.

828  
NOTES  
GROUP A

11. See this Section, Group G, note 7.
12. In the same verse Rashi further comments that it is the "Shechinah" that dwells in the Temple of Jerusalem. Perhaps in opposition to the idea of God Himself dwelling in the Temple as this is unbecoming of the Deity:-  
"מכאן אתה למד שלא נתן רשות להזכיר שם המפורש  
אלא במקום שהשכינה באה שם - וזהו בית הבחירה."
13. The same applies when the verb - אירא - refers to the Patriarchs e.g. GEN.18<sup>1</sup>; GEN.26<sup>2</sup>; GEN.35<sup>9</sup>. See Section, Veneration and Idealization of the Patriarchs, Group A.
14. See Sforno, GEN.20<sup>3</sup> who says that this is why regarding Laban, Balaam and Abimelech the text does not read  
- "and God was revealed to them":-  
"ויבוא - כענין שנאמר בלבן ובבלעם ולא נזכר בהם אז וירא אליו, ולא  
מראות .. ולא דבור .. כי אמנם לא נראה האל .. אבל בא אליהם קול קונא בלבו."  
See S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, op.cit. GEN.20<sup>3</sup>,  
p. 35.

15. On the subtle distinction between the prophecy of Moses and that of other prophets, see Maimonides הלכות יו"ט - ch.7, Halacha 6; cf. Guide to the Perplexed v.2, ch.35; his commentary on the Mishna, Sanh.ch.10, Mishna 1; his Introduction to the Ethics of the Fathers, ch.7.
16. Rashi's source is the Mechilta, Yithro, Parasha 4. However, it is interesting to note that the phrase - כסא הכבוד - in this context is an elaboration of Rashi's own. The Mechilta simply reads: - לא עלה משה למעלה ולא ירד הכבוד למטה אלא קלמד שאמר המקודש למשה הריע קורא לך מנאש ההר ואפה צולה שאמר וקרא ה' למשה -
17. On GEN.1<sup>2</sup> - רוח אלהים - The spirit of God was hovering. Rashi explains - כסא הכבוד עומד באויר ומרחף - "The throne of Divine Glory was standing in space hovering over the face of the waters". In other words it was not - רוח אלהים - but rather His throne of Glory. However, Rashi's source for this interpretation is Bab. Tal. Hag.15<sup>a</sup> - but there, too, the phraseology - כסא הכבוד - is not mentioned. Onkelos translates - "And a wind from before the Lord was blowing. cf. N.E.B. "And a mighty wind that swept over the surface of the waters".

NOTESGROUP A

18. Rashi - לא הוצרך לך, מלא בא ללמד לד"ת של -  
ישיעו הנדון עז שיראו ויבינו -
19. While here and EX.12<sup>23</sup> - Onkelos avoids the ascription of motion by translating - וַיֵּצֵא - in EX.32<sup>22</sup> -  
Onkelos translates - ושכתי כפי עליך עז עבר -  
literally - עז דא עבר. In DEUT.31<sup>3</sup> - הוא עובר לפניך -  
"He will pass before you". Onkelos does not translate -  
- but - מִמְרָא יַעְבֹּר קִדְמוֹךָ -  
"His Memra will pass before you". Perhaps in EX.33<sup>22</sup> -  
Onkelos translates literally because it is not referring directly to God, but to His Glory as the beginning of the verse shows - וְהָיָה בַעֲבֹר כְּבוֹדִי -
20. cf. Mechilta, Bo, Parasha 11; Midrash Hagadol, EX.p.187.
21. cf. Onkelos EX.12, vv.23,27. See Mechilta, Bo, Parasha 7 - וַאֲמַרְתָּ - Presumably - וַאֲמַרְתָּ - ought to be taken in the sense of "sparing" and not in the sense of "pity" - for this is in itself a human emotion which ought to be avoided when referring to the Deity. But conceivably the Rabbis, in their eagerness to get rid of the obvious problem, did not realise (or were not for the moment concerned) that in crediting God with pity they had involved themselves in another.



## NOTES

## GROUP A

22. cf. A.M. Silberman, The Pentateuch with Rashi's Commentary, EX. p.58, appendix 4.
23. cf. Onkelos NUM.23<sup>3</sup> - יקרה ה' לקראתי - יערץ מימר - cf. also NUM. vv.4,16. There are, however, inconsistencies in Onkelos for in EX.3<sup>18</sup> - נקרה ערלינו - he translates - נקרא - And in EX.5<sup>3</sup> - איך נקרי עלנא - In NUM.23<sup>4</sup> the Samaritan text reads - וימצא מלאך אלהים את בלעם - and in verse 3 the reading is - יקרא - "to call" (rather than the verb - קרה - to meet). In NUM.23<sup>16</sup> - ויקרא - the Samaritan text reads - ויקרה ה' אל בלעם - נקרה ערלינו - LXX in EX.3<sup>18</sup> - מלאך ה' אל בלעם - reads - He has commanded us. Most probably all this was done to soften the anthropomorphism of the Hebrew text. On this verb - קרה - to meet, see Ch. T. Fritsch, op.cit. pp.31-32.
24. Rashi - לקראת - מגיד שהשכינה יוצאה לקראתם כחתן היוצא לקראת כלה.
25. Rashi - והיה המלאך נעשה כמין נחש ובולעו מראשו ועד ירכיו - וחורר ובולעו מרגליו ועד אותו מקום וכך...  
cf. Bab.Tal.Ned.p.32; Midrash Hagadol, EX.p.77. See this Section, Group G, note 8.

26. See General Introduction, p.16 and p.39 ff.
27. cf. Onkelos EX.25<sup>22</sup>; EX.30<sup>6</sup>; NUM.17<sup>19</sup>. LXX also avoids the anthropomorphism -  $\alpha\mu\sigma\theta\eta\sigma\omega\varsigma$  - as if it were - '  $\text{אֶנֶךָ}$  (from -  $\text{יָדָע}$  ) I shall be known. See Ch.T. Fritsch, op.cit. p.30. But the possibility must be admitted that the Hebrew text in front of the LXX actually read -  $\text{אֶנֶךָ}$  - instead of -  $\text{אֶנֶךָ}$  - See this Section, Group G, Intermediary Elements, note 4.
28. Rashi EX.33<sup>21</sup> explains that the Holy One blessed be He is the "place" (  $\text{מָקוֹם}$  ) of the Universe (comprises the Universe) but His universe is not His place. (Does not encompass Him) cf. also Tanh. EX. Parashat Ki Tissa. See Montgomery J.A. The "Place" as an Appellation of Deity, Journal of Biblical Literature XXIV, pp.17-26.
29. Onkelos -  $\text{וְלֹא יִסְמָכוּן יְת מִשְׁרֵיתֵהוּן דִּי שְׂכִנְתֵּי שְׂרִיא בִּיְתֵהוּן}$
30. cf. NUM.16<sup>3</sup> -  $\text{וְיִשָּׁבְדוּ בְּרַגְלֵהֶם בְּיָדֵי הַיְּהוָה}$  - "And the Lord among them" - Onkelos translates -  $\text{וּבִיְתֵהוּן}$  -  $\text{שְׂרִיא שְׂכִנְתֵּיהֶן}$ . cf. also Onkelos DEUT. 12<sup>11</sup>; DEUT.12<sup>5</sup>; Onkelos and Rashi DEUT.33<sup>12</sup>.

31. Rashi - אשר בקרבכם - אם לא שנטעתי שכינתי ביניכם  
לא גבה לבבכם ליכנס לכל הדברים הללו

cf. Rashi EX.33<sup>10</sup>; EX.33<sup>7</sup>.

32. cf. Onkelos on - י"ס - EX.15<sup>22</sup>. See Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch.10. Rashi and the Text of Onkelos, note 23.

33. Rashi - ואונקלוס תרגם ואשא כמו ואסיץ אתכם, ואטלית  
יתכון תקן את הדבר דרך כבוד למעלה.

34. cf. Onkelos and Rashi EX.6<sup>8</sup>; NUM.14<sup>30</sup>; See A. Ibn Ezra on EX.6<sup>8</sup> who states that - נשארתי את ידי - is merely a metaphor: - נשאתי את ידי - דרך משל כאדם שישא ידו  
אל השמים וישבע.

NOTESGROUP B - REFERENCES TO HUMAN FORM AND ORGANS

1. See Maimonides, Guide to the Perplexed, v.2, ch. 1 and 2; Maimonides, - הלכות יסודי התורה פ"א ו.ח. -  
NUM. 23<sup>19</sup>; I Sam. ch.15<sup>29</sup>; LXX. likewise avoids the word "man". See Ch. T. Fritsch, op.cit. p.9.
2. cf. LXX. - "And the Glory of the Lord he saw". See Ch. T. Fritsch, p.9.
3. See S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. p.28; N. Adler, Netinah-Lager. Ps. Jonathan, however, translates - בדמות מן קדש ה' -
4. cf. Nahmanides. See this Section, Group I, References Exposed to Polytheistic Interpretation, note 2.
5. cf. Onkelos LEV.26<sup>17</sup>; LEV.20<sup>3</sup>; LEV.20<sup>5,6</sup>. On the other hand in EX.33<sup>14</sup> - שכינתי - is substituted by - שכינתני - "Shechinah". Similarly - שכינתך - EX.33<sup>15</sup> - פתך -  
The word - במ'מרה - DEUT.4<sup>37</sup> is translated - בפני -  
With His "Word". But - את פני ה' - GEN.19<sup>13</sup>; EX.32<sup>11</sup> - Onkelos translates it by - קדש ה' -. Similarly, the expression on - ולא יראו פני דיקם - EX.23<sup>15</sup>;  
DEUT.16<sup>16</sup> - Onkelos translates it by - קדמי דיק טין .

6. cf. Ps. Jonathan - ואיתן ית פנויה לא למעסוק בבר נשא  
See ch. Rashi and Ps. Jonathan's Targum. See Rashi,  
LEV.26<sup>17</sup>; LEV.20<sup>5</sup>. See Section, Rashi and Ps. Jonathan's  
Targum footnote 36.
7. See Group I, References Exposed to Polytheistic  
Interpretation, note 7. Also ch. Reverence to God,  
note 2.
8. cf. Rashi, GEN.11<sup>28</sup> - על פני דרח אביו.
9. cf. Onkelos NUM.12<sup>8</sup> who translates - פה אל פה -  
mouth to mouth by - ממלל עם ממלל - "word with  
word". cf. Onkelos EX.33<sup>11</sup> - ממלל בפני אל פנים -  
עם ממלל -
10. In GEN.32<sup>31</sup> - כי ראיתי אלהים פנים אל פנים - "For  
I have seen the Lord face to face - Onkelos translates  
- "For I have seen the Angel of the Lord face to face". cf. Ps.  
Jonathan. On the other hand in DEUT.34<sup>10</sup> while  
Onkelos translates literally, Ps. Jonathan and the Palest.  
Targum avoided the anthropomorphism: - ולא קם נביא עוד -  
בישראל במעשה די חכים יתיה מימרא דה' ממלל כל קבל ממלל  
See N. Adler, Netinah-Lager, DEUT.34<sup>10</sup>; S.B. Schefftel,  
Biura Onkelos, DEUT.34<sup>10</sup>.

NOTESGROUP B

11. I say in most cases because in DEUT.11<sup>12</sup> - עֵינֵי ה' -  
 עֵינֵי ה' בְּרַחֲמֵיךָ - "The eyes of the Lord your God are  
 always upon it". Onkelos translates literally.
12. cf. GEN.6<sup>8</sup>; GEN.38<sup>7</sup>; EX.33<sup>13</sup>; EX.33<sup>16</sup>; EX.34<sup>9</sup>; LEV.10<sup>19</sup>;  
 NUM.11<sup>11</sup>; NUM.23<sup>27</sup>; NUM.24<sup>1</sup>; NUM.32<sup>13</sup>; DEUT.4<sup>25</sup>; DEUT.6<sup>18</sup>;  
 DEUT.9<sup>18</sup>; DEUT.12<sup>25</sup>; DEUT.13<sup>19</sup>; DEUT.17<sup>2</sup>; DEUT.31<sup>29</sup>.
13. LXX also avoids this anthropomorphism, see Ch.T. Fritsch,  
 op. cit. p. 12.
14. Rashi's source is Siphre in the name of Rabbi Akiva,  
 Parashat Re'eh, Piska 79.
15. EX.17<sup>1</sup>; NUM.3<sup>16</sup>; NUM.3<sup>39</sup>; NUM.3<sup>51</sup>; NUM.4<sup>37</sup>; NUM.4<sup>41</sup>  
 NUM.4<sup>45</sup>; NUM.4<sup>49</sup>; NUM.10<sup>13</sup>; NUM.20<sup>24</sup>; NUM.27<sup>14</sup>; DEUT.8<sup>3</sup>.  
 In NUM.12<sup>8</sup> - פֶּה מֵל פֶּה - Onkelos translates - מִמֶּלֶךְ  
 מִמֶּלֶךְ - See Supra, footnote 9.
16. cf. Ps. Jonathan, but the Palest. Targum translates  
 literally.

837  
NOTES  
GROUP B

17. The Aramaic root - כח - corresponds to the Hebrew root - כח - and this is why Rashi translates - כח - by - הנחיה - guidance. See Section Rashi as Philologist, ch. 4 - Translation of Biblical Idioms into Aramaic, note 11.
18. In several cases the word - יד - (hand) when used in connection with God, is translated in the sense of - גבור - power and might. cf. Onkelos and Rashi EX.14<sup>31</sup>. In EX.13<sup>3</sup>; DEUT.4<sup>34</sup>; DEUT.5<sup>15</sup>; DEUT.7<sup>19</sup>; DEUT.11<sup>2</sup> DEUT.26<sup>8</sup> - however, Onkelos takes - יד - literally. It may be because nothing in the context determines that the - יד - is that of the Deity. It simply means - גבור - "might". Rashi in Isaiah, ch.8<sup>11</sup> takes - יד - in the sense of - נבואה - "prophecy".
19. In EX.24<sup>10</sup> - ותחת רגליו - "And under his feet". Onkelos translates - ותחת כרסא קריה - "And under the throne of His divine Glory". See Maimonides, Guide to The Perplexed, v.1. ch.28.
20. There are, however, inconsistencies in Onkelos for in EX.6<sup>6</sup>; DEUT.4<sup>34</sup>; DEUT.9<sup>29</sup> - יד - is translated literally. On the text in question, cf. Ps. Jonathan and the Palest. Targum.
21. See Nahmanides, GEN.46<sup>1</sup>. See Midrashic Section, Group A, note 36.
22. - See this Section (supra) Group A note 25

GROUP C - REFERENCES TO HUMAN EMOTIONSANTHROPOPATHISMS

1. cf. Onkelos GEN.6<sup>7</sup>. But again there is no consistency for in EX.32<sup>12</sup>; EX.32<sup>14</sup> Onkelos translates literally. See Onkelos DEUT.32<sup>36</sup>; NUM.23<sup>19</sup>.
2. R. Loewe has examined this and all other passages where - נחם - is used of God in Vetus Testamentum, pp.261-272. See Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch.2, note 2.
3. - ויתעצב - האדם אל לבו של מקום עלה במחשבתו על מקום להעצבו זה תרגום על אונקלוס.  
See Ps. Jonathan - ואיד"ן עליהן במימריה -  
Neofiti reads - ואתפ"ס עם לביר -
4. cf. Onkelos DEUT.28<sup>39</sup> - ולא תאגור - by - ולא תכנש -  
See Prov.6<sup>8</sup>; Prov.10<sup>5</sup>; cf. Siphre Haazinu, Piska 322 -  
- אין אגור אלא כנוס שנאמר דברי אגור בן יקא.  
Prov.30<sup>1</sup>.
5. cf. Onkelos LEV.26<sup>11</sup>; LEV.26<sup>44</sup>.
6. On the expression DEUT.1<sup>37</sup> - גם ב' התאנף ר' -  
"Also the Eternal was wrath with me". - Onkelos weakens the anthropomorphism - רגז מן קדש ר' - the wrath from before the Lord. But in DEUT.1<sup>34</sup> Onkelos translates -  
- ורגז - literally - וקצוף -



839  
NOTES  
GROUP B

7. Jonathan's Targum on the Prophets does not follow a consistent policy in this area, either. In several human emotions attributed to the Deity, Jonathan translates them literally. (e.g. Mal.1<sup>2</sup>; Hosea 11<sup>1</sup>; Joel 2<sup>18</sup>; Amos 5<sup>21</sup>; Amos 7<sup>3,6</sup>). On the other hand, the expression, Is.1<sup>14</sup> - שְׂנֵאָה נַפְשִׁי - "My soul hates" - Jonathan has toned down the anthropomorphism, and substitutes it by - רִחִיק מִיָּמִי -

NOTESGROUP D - REFERENCES TO PHYSICAL REACTIONS

1. N.E.B. reads - But Moses set himself to "placate" the Lord his God. Some suggest that the original meaning was to stroke the face of someone, and thus to placate in that way, from the idea of stroking the idol in prayer. See Ch. T. Fritsch, op.cit. p.10, note 5, see Mal. 1<sup>9</sup>.
  
2. N.E.B. reads - He ceased work and refreshed himself, literally "took a <sup>11</sup>[deep] breath" ( וַיָּנַח ).  
cf. Rashi, EX.20<sup>11</sup> s.v וַיָּנַח

NOTESGROUP E - REFERENCE TO HUMAN SENSES

1. Onkelos' translation is simply inadequate for while he was careful with the textual word - רוח - he, however, substituted - בּוֹמֶךְ - "nose" by - פִּי - "mouth" - which is in itself a gross anthropomorphism.
2. See Maimonides - הלכות יסודי התורה - See Rashi I. Sam. 16<sup>13</sup> - where in a remarkable way he explains - רוח גבורה - "the breath of the Lord" - by - רוח - the spirit of power (strength); cf. Onkelos and Rashi GEN.1<sup>1</sup> on the expression - ורוח אלהים מרחפת -
3. Rashi's statement - אמרתי ונעשה רצוני - is not mentioned in Bab.Tal.Zeb.46<sup>b</sup> or in Siphra, Piska 58 - where the text is discussed. It simply says - נִחוּחַ - לָשׁוֹן - cf. also Rashi EX.29<sup>25</sup>; -  
- לְרוּחַ נִחוּחַ - לְנֶחֱת רֹחַ, לְמִי שֶׁאָמַר וְנַעֲשֶׂה רְצוֹנוֹ -
4. See Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. Netiv ha-Shelishi, p.3.
5. cf. Mechilta Bo, Parasha 7; Midrash Hagadol, EX. op. cit. p. 190.
6. Also wherever the verb - שָׁמַע - means agreeing with a person's statement, Onkelos translates it by - קִבֵּל - e.g. GEN.37<sup>27</sup>. See Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch.4. Translation of Biblical Idioms into Aramaic, note 10.

NOTESGROUP E

7. cf. also Jonathan on the Prophets, Is.1<sup>15</sup>; Jer.7<sup>16</sup>.
8. Guide to the Perplexed, v.1, ch.45 and ch.48. However, even here there is no consistent policy, for according to his distinction, one would expect Jonathan to translate II Kings, 19<sup>16</sup> - ה' שָׁמַע אֶת אֲשֶׁר - the verb - שָׁמַע - by - קָבַל - but in fact our version reads - כִּי שָׁמַע - . Again GEN.21<sup>17</sup> - אֱלֹהִים אָל קוֹל הַנַּעַר - "For God hath heard the voice of the lad where he is" - Onkelos translates - קָבַל ה' צְלוּתָהּ - when in fact (according to Maimonides ) one would expect - אֱרִי שָׁמַע קוֹם ה' יֵת קְלִידָּהּ - "And the Lord accepted his prayer". Perhaps, however, in these two cases, Maimonides had a different version.
9. cf. Rashi DEUT.1<sup>45</sup> - וְלֹא שָׁמַע בְּקוֹלְכֶם - "The Eternal would not hear your voice". - Rashi explains - וְלֹא שָׁמַע - כִּי כוֹל עֲשִׂיתָ מִדַּת רַחֲמִין כְּאִלּוּ אִכְזָר - "If it is at all possible to say so of God, you caused his attribute of mercy [ to act ] as though it were cruel." In his usual sensitivity Rashi avoids the anthropomorphism by explaining the verb - שָׁמַע - not in its literal sense, but rather - מִדַּת רַחֲמִין - His attribute of mercy.

10. Rashi - וישמע את הקול מדבר אליו - ואינו קורא מדבר אליו - כשהוא קורא מדבר פתיונו הקול מדבר בינו לבין עצמו וההדיוט שומע מא ליו, וכשהוא קורא מדבר משמע שהמלך מדבר עם ההדיוט -  
 cf. Rashi on EX.33<sup>11</sup>; Ps. Jonathan EX.33<sup>9</sup>, 11.
11. cf. Rashi DEUT.33<sup>3</sup> - מדבר-ותך - thy decisions.
12. See Maimonides, Guide to the Perplexed, v.2, ch.33, who explains that although Moses and Israel heard the voice of God at Mount Sinai, yet there was a definite distinction between the ability of Moses in comprehending the "voice" and that of Israel. This is illustrated by the Targum Onkelos. In every case where the Torah says -  
 - ומליל ה' עם משה - "And God spoke to Moses" - Onkelos translates -  
 - וידבר אלהים את כל הדברים - Similarly EX.20<sup>1</sup> -  
 "And God spoke all these words" - Onkelos translates -  
 - but when ומליל ה' ית כל פתגמיה -  
 - ואל ידבר עמנו אלהים - EX.20<sup>16</sup> -  
 "But let not God speak with us" - Onkelos translates -  
 - ולא יתמלל עמנא מן קדם רהי (Onkelos uses the Hithpael). "But let it not be spoken in our presence from before the Lord" :-  
 "ורע כי גש זה הקול לא  
 היתה דרגתם בו שזה לדרגת מעט רביו, ואע"פ אעירך על סור זה  
 וכו'. והוא שכל מקום שתמצא בו וידבר ה' אל משה לאמר

## NOTES

## GROUP E

12. (cont'd) מתרגם אותו אונקלוס אמלל ה'. וכן וידבר אלהים ארץ  
כל הדברים, ומליל ה' ית כל פתגמיה. אבל בשאמר  
ישראל למשה, ואל ידבר עמנו אלהים, תרגמו ולא  
יתמלל עמנא מן קדם ה'. הנה באר לך (אונקלוס) עליו  
השלוש את הכללות כפי שחלקנור.

In other words there was no direct speech with Israel, but they simply heard a "voice from before the Lord".

Maimonides' theory is not convincing for even with regard to Moses, Onkelos EX.33<sup>9</sup> had used the Hithpael - ומתמלל עמשה = ודבר עם משה -

distinction lies in the fact that with regard to Moses the words - "From before the Lord" -

are not mentioned. This subtle distinction can be supported by the fact that while in NUM.7<sup>89</sup> - ובבוא

"And He (God) spoke to him" (Moses) - Onkelos translates - ומתמלל עמיה - (referring to the voice), in DEUT.5<sup>21</sup> - (with regard to the Israelites) - כידבר אלהים את האדם ומי -

"We have seen this day that God doth speak with man, and he liveth" - Onkelos translates - ארי מתמלל -

One can see that the expression - מן קדם ה' - is used only with regard

to the Israelites. This is, however, according to N. Adler (in his Introduction, note 10, footnote 1)

who quotes this version. But in all other books of Targum Onkelos, including that of A. Sperber, the reading in DEUT.5<sup>21</sup> is literal - ארי ימלל ה' עם -

אנשא ויתקיים -

NOTESGROUP F - PREPOSITIONS IMPLYING MOTION  
OR OTHER CORPOREALITY

1. See Nahmanides:- ואונקלוס שתרגם וקר'בת יתכון לפולחן  
דרך כבוד של מעלה תפס לעצמו -
2. See Isaac Avinery, Hechal Rashi, v.3, p.145.
3. cf. Rashi, EX.20<sup>11</sup> - s.v - וינח - "And God rested".  
See this Section, Group D, note 2.
4. There is, however, no consistency in Onkelos, for in  
the following verse (v.13) - כי לי כל בכור - "Because  
all the firstborn are mine" - Onkelos translates literally  
- ארי לי כל בוכר א. Similarly (in the same verse) the  
expression - לי יהיו - "Mine shall they be" - Onkelos  
translates literally. On the other hand, the phrase  
- הקדשתי לי כל בכור - "I sanctified to me" - Onkelos  
reads - אקדשתי קדמי - "I sanctified before Me".
5. cf. Onkelos, NUM.16<sup>9</sup> on the preposition - אל - cf.  
Rashi NUM.16<sup>10</sup>.
6. See this Section, Group E, References to Human Senses,  
note 5 (EX.33<sup>9</sup>).

7. See GEN.28<sup>15</sup> where Rashi explains - **את אשר דברתי לך** - Until I have done that which I have spoken to thee - by **לצרכך ועליך** - that which "I have spoken in thy interest and concerning thee." Rashi, once again, explains that - **לך** - or - **לי** - "in the same way whenever - **לך** - or - **לו** - or - **להם** - are used after a verbal form of **דבר** - they are used in the sense of **על** - concerning ( **וזה** - **וזה** ). This ( **וכי עשרי עם יעקב לא דבר קודם לכן** - ). This verse proves that this is so, since it cannot mean - "I have spoken to thee" - as God had never spoken to Jacob before this occasion". See Nahmanides, who argues with Rashi for in EX.32<sup>34</sup> - the text reads - **לך נמה את** - **לך** - "Now go, lead the people unto the place of which I have spoken unto thee" - (and it is impossible to explain:- **עליך** - "concerning you" for God had spoken before to Moses). See G.B. Chavel in his glosses on Nahmanides, Mossad Harav Kook, Jerusalem 1969, v.1, pp. 135-136; Rabbi E. Mizrahi.



NOTESGROUP G - INTERMEDIARY ELEMENTS -(OR DIVINE NAME, ELABORATED OR SUBSTITUTED)

1. See this Section, Group A, Motion and Place Denied God, note 1, footnote 2.
2. cf. Rashi GEN.32<sup>24</sup> - ופרשו ר"ל שהוא שרו על עטו -  
 "Our Rabbis of blessed memory explained that he was Esau's guardian Angel". cf. GEN. Rabbah 78,3; Yalk. Shimoni 247,133; Midrash Hagadol, GEN.p.574. There is inconsistency in Onkelos for whilst in GEN.32<sup>30</sup> Onkelos takes - פנ אלהים - as - מלאך - "Angel", in GEN.33<sup>10</sup> he translates - פנ אלהים - by - אפי רברבא - "great people". Ps. Jonathan is consistent and in both places he translates - אפי מלאכא -.
3. See ch. Rashi and Ps. Jonathan's Targum, note 14.
4. On this verb - נָגַד - See this Section, Group A, note 19.
5. See this Section, Group A, Motion and Place Denied God, note 3.
6. cf. Rashi EX.34<sup>10</sup>; this Section, Group A, note 1.

NOTESGROUP G

7. See this Section, Group A, note 8.

8. Rashi - ואמנ מה נענא לפי שנתעסק במלון... והיה המלאך  
נעשה כמין נחש... (נדרים לב.).

See this Section, Group A, Motion and Place Denied God,  
note 18.

9. Rashi.... בפניו - באדם המנהיג בנו לפניו שנאמר  
ו'סע מלאך.... ההלך.... -

cf. Rashi EX.14<sup>19</sup>.

NOTES

GROUP H - DIRECT AND INDIRECT SOFTENING  
(OR FREE SUBSTITUTION)

1. cf. Rashi EX.17<sup>15</sup>; Jud. 6<sup>24</sup>.
  
2. The LXX translates "the Lord is my refuge". It appears that the LXX has connected the word - 'נ'ס - with the root - נס' - to flee, to escape. See Ch.T. Fritsch, op. cit. p. 37. It is not necessary here to enter into the question of the textual originality of - 'נס' - and its relationship to the following explanation - ...כס'ל ע'ל
  
3. cf. DEUT.33<sup>29</sup> - מגן עזר - "The Shield of thy help". Although it is used in a metaphorical sense yet, comparing God to a shield is, somehow, disrespectful to the Deity. Onkelos, therefore, translates - ת'ק'ף - ג'ס עזר - "the Mighty is thy help". Thus softening the idea considerably. See also in the same verse how Onkelos gets around the metaphor of calling God a "sword". Similarly the LXX avoids literal translation where - מגן - is used metaphorically of God in Psalms 84<sup>12</sup> - כ'טמא ומגן ה' -
  
4. See Rashi EX.19<sup>18</sup>; EX.15<sup>8</sup>; EX.19<sup>4</sup>; EX.19<sup>19</sup>; EX.31<sup>17</sup>. On the verse in question cf. Ps. Jonathan and the Palest. Targum..... תוקפא, ורוממותא, תושבחתא, וגבורתא דידיה היא

NOTESGROUP H

5. On the subject of the "face of the Lord". See Maimonides, Guide to the Perplexed, v.1, ch.37.
6. cf. Ibn Ezra on verse 34 - הנה פירוש לפנ ה' - לפנ  
העדות שהוא הארון -  
cf. Rabbi Samuel Ben Meir.
7. See this Section, Group A, Motion and Place Denied God, note 19 on the verb - יָצָא.
8. cf. GEN. Rabbah, 68,9; EX. Rabbah, 45, 6; Tanhuma, Ki Tissa, 27; Tanhuma Buber, v.1, 16; Midrash Tannaim, p.222; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p. 498; ibid, EX. p.705.
9. See Group I, References Exposed to Polytheistic Interpretation.
10. See Ibn Ezra and Nahmanides.
11. cf. EX.22<sup>8</sup> where Onkelos and Rashi take - עַד הָאֱלֹהִים -  
to mean "Judges".
12. cf. Onkelos NUM.18<sup>20</sup>; DEUT.18<sup>2</sup>. See N. Adler, Netinah-Lager, on NUM.18<sup>20</sup>.

NOTESGROUP I - REFERENCES EXPOSED TO POLYTHEISTIC INTERPRETATION

1. cf. Midrashic Section, Group C, note 3. See also ch. Rashi and Ps. Jonathan's Targum, note 1.
  
2. It is said that to avoid exposure to the concept of Polytheistic construction the 70 Elders who translated the Torah into Greek "for Ptolemy" have inserted in this chapter of GEN: - אָמַעַה אֱלֹהִים בְּצֶלֶם וּבְדִמְיוֹנֵהוּ -  
 On this subject, see Mechilta Parashat Bo; Palest. Tal. Meg. ch.1, Halacha 9; Bab.Tal.Meg. p.9<sup>a</sup>; Sopherim, ch.1, Halacha 8; A. Geiger, Hamikra ve-Targumav, pp.281-287; this Section, Group B, Reference to Human Form and Organs, note 3.  
 Great emphasis was also placed on this text by the Church as an argument for the trinity.
  
3. Here also the 70 Elders rendered it for Ptolemy - הַבְּרִי -  
אֱלֹהִים אֶרְרָה וְאֶבְלָה שֶׁ שֶׁפֶתַם - cf. Mechilta, Parashat Bo; see the above note; A. Geiger, Hamikra ve-Targumav, p.282.
  
4. By translating - נִתְגַּלִּי - by נִרְדָּד - Onkelos avoided the idea of motion; cf. this Section, Group A, Motion and Place Denied God, note 11. However, it is surprising to see that Onkelos has left the text in the plural form.

5. Onkelos has changed the verb - **הִדְּעוּ** - from the Hiphil to the Kal - **זָעוּ** - See H. Levenstein, Nephesh Hager, op. cit. p. 68. In GEN. Rabbah 52, 11 seems to explain Onkelos' interpretation: - **וּבְשָׁעָה שֶׁבִּיקְעוּ הָעֲנוֹשׁ לְהַתְּעוֹרֵר - אֹתוֹ, נִגְלָה עָלָי הַקֶּבֶ"ה וְאָמַר לִי לֵךְ לָךְ . . . .**

"And when the idol worshippers tried to mislead me, the Holy One blessed be He was revealed to me and said go out from your land". The onus of responsibility is thus removed from God. cf. Midrashic Section, Group A, note 4. See ch., Reverence to God, note 5. In addition, there is also an argument among the Rabbis as to whether - **אֱלֹהִים** - in this verse is - **קדש** - or - **חור** - . See Sopherim 4,6; Palest. Tal. Meg. ch.1, Halacha 9.

6. cf. DEUT.4<sup>7</sup> - **אֱלֹהִים קְרוֹבִים** - Onkelos, however, takes it in singular - **אֱלֹהֵא קְרִיב** .
7. cf. Rashi EX.22<sup>19</sup> .See this Section, Group B, References to Human Form and Organs, note 5; ch., Reverence to God, note 2, footnote 4.
8. cf. Siphre, Haazinu, Pardes (Malbim), v.2. p.1632, 17.

REVERENCE TO GOD

1. See S. Luzzatto, *Oheb-Ger.* p.35, N. Adler, *Netinah- Lager*, holds that this is the correct reading in Onkelos. Furthermore, whenever the terms - אֱלֹהִים - or - אֱלֹהִי - are mentioned in the Torah, with regard to idols, Onkelos translates them by - יִרְאָה - "Fear". This was done out of reverence to God, in order to distinguish between the true God and other gods e.g. GEN.31<sup>30</sup>; EX.32<sup>1</sup>.
2. Or it can be translated "among the mighty" (see Rashi). The N.E.B. reads: "Among the gods".
3. cf. Onkelos DEUT.4<sup>7</sup> where Onkelos translates אֱלֹהִים קְרוֹבִים - in singular.
4. cf. Rashi EX.20<sup>3</sup> s.v - אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים - See Section, Anthropomorphisms, Group B, note 5 and Group I, note 7.
5. The Pentateuch with Rashi's Commentary. N.E.B. however, is closer to the Targum Onkelos.
6. See also GEN.30<sup>2</sup> and GEN.50<sup>19</sup> where Onkelos substituted a positive statement in the place of a rhetorical question.

854  
NOTES  
REVERENCE TO GOD

7. cf. GEN.18<sup>25</sup>; GEN.30<sup>2</sup>; GEN.50<sup>19</sup>; NUM.23<sup>19</sup>.
  
8. See Midrashic Section, Group A, note 4. Also Section, Anthropomorphisms, Group I, References Exposed to Polytheistic Interpretation, note 4. On the text in question Rashi offers a different interpretation and one can see from it how he has indeed removed any degradation of God's character.
  
9. The Pentateuch with Rashi's Commentary.
  
10. Ps. Jonathan translates - כל דשמך יתמה ערלי.
  
11. cf. Ps. Jonathan - וזי לא איודוג ליה ומן קדם ה' ארע  
עיקתיה לידיו . . . .
  
12. The words "descending it" must be added in Rashi because the Mishna, Mac.II. 1, expressly states that only if the accident happens when he is descending. This is derived from the text (NUM.35<sup>23</sup>) - ויפל עליו וימר - which is taken to mean - ער שיפל דרך נפילו. But one who falls when ascending a ladder and thus kills another is not banished to the city of refuge. See Bab.Tal.Mac.7<sup>b</sup>; Rashi NUM.35<sup>23</sup>.



REVERENCE TO GOD

13. Rashi - אנה לידו - ולמה תצא זאת מלפניו וכו'... במה הכתוב מדבר? בשט בט אדם אחד הרג שוגג ואחד הרג מויד ולא היו עדים בדבר שיצידו. זה לא נהרג וזה לא גלה. והקב"ה מזמין לפונדק אחד, זה שהרג במויד יושב תחת הסולם וזה שהרג שוגג עולה בסולם ונופל על זה שהרג במויד והרגו, ועדים מעידים עליו ומחייבים אותו לגלות, נמצא זה שהרג בשוגג גולה וזה שהרג במויד נהרג.

See Mechilta, Mishpatim, Parasha 4, p.80; Bab.Tal.Mac. 10<sup>b</sup>; Yalk. Shimoni 323.

14. See Midrashic Section, Group C, note 35.

15. cf. Onkelos' translation LEV.24<sup>14, 15, 23</sup>.

NOTESINTRODUCTION - VENERATION OF THE PATRIARCHS AND THEIR DESCENDANTS

1. The Aramaic word - נס'ברך - is equivalent to the word - לקחך - See Onkelos GEN.31<sup>34</sup> - ורחל לקחה - is translated by - ורחל נס'ברך -
2. The N.E.B. paraphrases these phrases in v.26 - ותגבאת לבבי - "You have deceived me", and in v. 27 למה נחבאת לברוח ותגבתי - "Why did you slip away secretly without telling me".
3. cf. also GEN.31<sup>20</sup>. See Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. p.5.
4. cf. GEN. 27<sup>43</sup> where Onkelos translates - ברח לך - by - כי ברח העם - cf. also EX.14<sup>5</sup> - מקיל לך - that the people went, instead of "fled".
5. It appears also that Onkelos saves even the honour of heathen prophets for in NUM.24<sup>11</sup> - ועדה ברח לך - "And now flee thou to thy place" - Onkelos translates - .. ויפן א'ול - and not as Ps. Jonathan who translates - ערוק לך - which is indeed the correct translation of the Hebrew word - ברח. There are, however, inconsistencies in Onkelos' Targum for in GEN.35<sup>1</sup> - בברחך מפני עשו - he translates - ויברח משה - See, also EX.2<sup>15</sup> - במקרקך מן קדש עשו אחיך - "And Moses fled" - Onkelos translates - וערק .

INTRODUCTION

5. (cont'd).

In honour of Moses one would expect - לָיָח - and  
"he went". See S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos,  
GEN.31<sup>20</sup> who endeavours to give a different explanation  
on the inconsistencies of Onkelos.

NOTESVENERATION AND IDEALIZATION OF THE PATRIARCHS AND THEIRWIVESGROUP A

1. Rashi: - וְכָנַח רַחֵל אֶת הַתְּרֵפֶה - לְהַפְרִישׁ אֶת אֲבִיהָ מִצְבוֹרָה וְרָה נִתְכוּוֹנָה  
cf. GEN. Rabbah 74.5.
2. Ps. Jonathan explains as Rashi: כֹּל אֶל דְּמִתָּהּ -  
- "lest the king who is singled out from the people". The question, therefore, arises has Rashi seen Ps. Jonathan? On this subject see Rashi and Ps. Jonathan's Targum. The Palest. Targum, however, translates literally - אִילוּ שָׁמַע חָד - מִלִּי -  
"if someone (i.e. any Tom, Dick or Harry) had slept with your wife".
3. The Pentateuch with Rashi's Commentary. N.E.B. translates:  
"Rachel said, I have played a fine trick on my sister, and it has succeeded, so she named him Naphtali".
4. Rashi: - וְאוֹנְקֵלוֹס תְּרַגֵּם לְשׁוֹן תְּפִלָּה כִּמְוָה נִתְפָּלִי אֱלֹהִים נִתְפָּלִי בְּקִשּׁוֹרִי -  
הַחֲבִיבוֹת לִפְנֵי נִתְקַבְּלִי וְנִקְטְרִי כְּאִחֹרִי .  
Onkelos translated it in the sense of prayer, in this way - נִתְפָּלִי means prayers that were pleasing to God. I prayed and I was accepted, and was answered like my sister. - נִתְפָּלִי לִי - treated as - נִתְפָּלִי לִי -
5. cf. Oheb-Ger. p. 9. See section, Rashi as Philologist ch. 8 note 9.

859  
NOTES  
GROUP A

6. - זעב אהליש. שט אהליש בית מדרשו של שם ובית מדרשו של עבר.
7. See Midrashic Section, Group C, note 16. See also Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch.3, note 11.
8. LXX takes it in this sense:- "Thy brother hath come deceitfully and taken thy blessing"; cf. also Ibn Ezra - "He did not speak the truth". - במרמה. שלא דבר אמר
9. See also Onkelos and Rashi on GEN.27<sup>36</sup> - s.v - ו'עקבני. See also Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch.3, Free Translation, note 11.
10. Ibn Ezra, too, takes - רכות - in its literal sense.
11. Rashi:- רכות - שהיתה סבורה לעלות בגורלו של עשו ובוכה שהיו הכל - אומרים שט בטעם לרבקה ושתי בנות ללבן הגדולה לגדול והקטנה לקטן - cf. Bab.Tal. Baba Bathra 123<sup>a</sup>; GEN. Rabbah 70, 16.  
To one Rabbi who translated - רכות - by - רכיבין - tender (weak). Rabbi Johanan replied - עיניו דאימך גוו ורכיבין - "your mother's eyes were weak; cf. also ibid 71,2;  
Tanhuma Vayetse, 4; Tanhuma Buber, Vayetse, ch.20 and 21; Midrash Aggadah; Sechel Tov; Lekah-Tov; Ps. Jonathan; Palest.Targum; Midrash Hagadol. GEN.p.515:-

11. (cont'd) - מא' רכות אלימא רכות מקמא אפשר בגנות בהמה  
טמאה לא דיבר הכתוב, ומן הבהמה אשר איננה טהורה  
בגנותן של צדיקים דיבר הכתוב וכו'...

It appears out of respect to Leah all the Midrashim  
and Targumim strained to avoid taking the word - רכות -  
in its literal sense.

12. Rashi - - אנכי עשו בכרך - אנכי המביא לך ועשו הוא בכרך

13. - ואמר עשו לאבורה' אנא עשו בוכרך  
Ibn Ezra, too, takes the text literally and proves that  
King David and others told "white lies" to achieve their  
purpose.

14. See S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, p.48; N. Adler,  
Netinah-Lager.

15. Ps. Jonathan translates literally - ואין לוטין ילטינך -  
"And if he shall curse you  
with any curses they shall be upon me". One can see,  
therefore, that the theory that Onkelos is a short  
version of Ps. Jonathan is open to question. See Midrashic  
Section, Group C.GEN.48<sup>22</sup>, note 24.

NOTESGROUP A

16. See Gesenius, 90 L-N, p. 253. See ch. Rashi and Ps. Jonathan's Targum, note 8.

17. Rabbi Saadia Gaon takes - גַּבְרִי - in the sense of - עָמַלְתִּי - "I toiled". It appears that Saadia Gaon read in the text - (or - גַּבְרִי -) and also Onkelos takes it in this sense. Menachem Ben Seruk writes that -  
הַמְּפַרְשִׁים הַקְּדוֹמוֹנִים יִיחָסוּ לְמַלְכָּה וְזוֹ מַלְכָּה  
הַהוּרָאָה שֶׁל גַּבְרִי אֵת הַהוּרָאָה שֶׁל שְׁמִירָה  
בְּכַתּוּב שֶׁלָּנוּ וּבִזְכָּרֶיהָ ה. ג.

the ancient commentators have explained - גַּבְרִי -

in the sense of - שְׁמִירָה - "keeping". Dunash Ben

Labrat refutes Saadia Gaon and explains: - וְזוֹ פִירָעַ

(רַב סָעֲדִיָּה) גַּבְרִי יוֹשֵׁב - עָמַלְתִּי מִן לַשּׁוֹן עָמַל וַיִּגְעָה, וְאִילוּ כֹלֵם  
לַשּׁוֹן גַּבְרִי הֵם וְאִינֶם לַשּׁוֹן עָמַל כֹּל עֵינֵי - .. וּבְפִתְרוֹנוֹ  
גַּבְרִי עָשִׂיתִי הַמְּרִיב לַשּׁוֹן הַעֲבָרִית. וְאֵת אִמְרֵי בִפְטוּרָה  
כִּי הָיָה יִתְרָה הָיָה כִּמוֹ מַלְאָכִי מִשְׁפָּט וְהָיָה הַפְּטוּרִין גַּבְרִי,  
הַגַּבְרִי מִן הַיּוֹשֵׁב וּמִן הַלֵּילָה לְפִי שִׁעְקָב אֲבִינוֹ אִשְׁרָה אֵת  
עַצְמוֹ בְּשְׁמִירָה וְאִמְרָה לִלְבֵּן אֵת לֹא אִבְדֵּיתִי לְךָ כְּלוֹם  
דָּבָר וְאִשְׁ אֲבָד כְּלוֹם בֵּין גַּבְרִי יוֹשֵׁב וּבֵין גַּבְרִי  
לֵילָה שְׁמִירָתִי לְפִי שִׁמְרֵתִי צֶאֱנֶךָ שִׁמּוֹר גְּמוּרָה  
וְלֹא נִגְבָּ לִי כְּלוֹם לֹא יוֹשֵׁב וְלֹא לֵילָה.

NOTESGROUP A

## 17. (cont'd).

that the "Yod" is redundant and not the suffix of the personal pronoun as in Is. 1<sup>21</sup> - מלאכי מעשה

See A. Geiger, Hamikra ve-Targumav, p.298 who quotes the argument between Rab. Saadia, on one side and

Menachem and Dunash on the other. See also Rab. Saadia Gaon on the Torah, by J. Kafih, Jerusalem, 1963, p.39.

Rashi and Ibn Ezra follow Dunash Ben Labrat. The Samaritan text reads - גנו ברך - without the "Yod". The theory that - גנברך - can be taken in the sense of - שמירה - "keeping" has some support in the Bab.Tal.

Bab. Metsia 93<sup>a</sup> - where the Talmud states that Jacob said to Laban that he would look after his sheep as a - חון

- as "a guard of the city": - א'ת'ביה ער מתי שומר

שכר חייב לשמור ער כפי הי"ח ביום אכלט חורב וקרח בלילה  
.. אמר ליה אטו יעקב אבינו חון דמדתא קוה, דאמר ליה

ללבן נשרי לך נשירותא ותירה כחזט מדא.

See S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, Munich, 1888, p.55.

N.H. Tur-Sinai (pp.147-148, Jerusalem 1938. - ספר מאגנס)

believes that the original version of Onkelos was as

follows:- נשרית כמה דמקדשט ביממא ונשרית ממך  
דמקדשט בלילה.

and only at a later time this version somehow was shortened. See J. Komlosch, pp.211-212; M. Levenstein Nephesh Hager, pp.109-110.



NOTESGROUP A

18. Rashi - גנבת יום - גנבת יום או גנבת לילה הכל שלמר -  
 cf. too, Ps. Jonathan and Palest. Targum - the latter  
 translates as follows:- ומן דהו גנב'א גנב'ין ביממא  
 וחיות ברא מרמא כלל בלילא חנא הו'נא משלם  
 יתרה.

"And what thieves stole by day or wild beasts devoured  
 by night I have paid it". Both Targumim take - גנב'ר -  
 in its literal sense, and not like Onkelos. The Targumim  
 also support Rashi that anything stolen was paid by  
 Jacob, and not like Dunash Ben Labrat (see the above  
 note 17) that nothing was stolen from Jacob.

19. Rashi - שכל זמן ששרה קיימת היה נר דלוק מקרב שבת לערב -  
 שבת וברכה מצויה בעיסה וענן קשור על האהל וכו'...  
 cf. GEN. Rabbah 60, 16; Yalk. Shimoni, 109. Ps.  
 Jonathan; see Midrashic Section, Group C, note 15.

20. See Midrashic Section, Group C, note 12; Bab. Tal.  
 Kid. 32<sup>b</sup>; Siphre, Piska 38; Mechilta, Yithro, Parasha  
 1; Rashi, GEN.18<sup>4</sup>.

NOTESGROUP A

21. - עשו בחרן - שהכניסן תחת כנפי השכינה, אברהם -  
 מג"ר את האנשים ושרה מג"ר הנשים.  
 cf. Bab.Tal. Abod. Zar. 9<sup>a</sup>; GEN. Rabbah 39,14; GEN.  
 Rabbah 84.4.Bab.Tal.Sanh.99<sup>b</sup> - כל המלמד את בן  
 חבירו תורה מעלה עליו הכתוב כאילו עשה.  
 Siphre DEUT. Piska 32; Ps. Jonathan; Palest.Targum;  
 Neofiti. See also Midrashic Section, Group C, note 10.

22. The Pentateuch with Rashi's Commentary. N.E.B.  
 however takes - לָשׁוּחַ - to mean - "to relieve himself"  
 See Midrashic Section, Group C, note 14.

23. Rashi - לָשׁוּחַ בַּשָּׂדֶה - לָשׁוּחַ תַּפְלָה, כְּמוֹ יִשְׁכַּךְ שִׁיחוֹ (תה' קב.) -  
 NUM.  
 In this sense, too, the Midrashim take it; Rabbah 2, 1.  
 Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p.410; GEN. Rabbah 60,14. See  
 the Midrashic Section, <sup>Group C</sup> note 14; Mechilta - מִסְכַּתָּא דְּהַי בְּשַׁלַּח -  
 Parasha 2; Mechilta de Rabbi Shimon, Beshalach, 14,10;  
 Tanhuma, Chaye Sarah, 6; Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer, 16;  
 Midrash, Prov. ch.22,28; Ps. Jonathan; Palest. Targum;  
 Neofiti.

24. cf. The Midrashic Section, Group C, note 24; Bab.Tal.  
 Baba Bathra 123<sup>a</sup>; Yalk. Shimoni 157; Mechilta de Rabbi  
 Ishmael, Beshalach, Parasha 2; Mechilta de Rabbi Shimon,  
 Beshalach, 14,10; GEN. Rabbah 96,6; Palest. Targum; Neofiti.

NOTESVENERATION AND IDEALIZATION OF THE PATRIARCH'S SONSGROUP B

1. N.E.B.'s translation; cf. also LXX.
2. Literally "with wisdom .
3. Rashi - הכתוב אומר שלא היתה רמיה שגרי' מימא את דינה אחותה .  
- כה את סבור רמיות דבריה - cf. too, GEN. Rabbah 80, 8  
יש כאן ורוח הקדש אומרת אשר שמא את דינה אחותה .
4. - בית איש כנעני - אמר אונקלוס תגרא כלומר איש סוחר . . .  
ודעתו לומר כי בני יעקב ישתמרו מלישא כנעניות כאשר  
צוה אברהם יצחק . . . וכן הוכדו בגמרא במסכת פסחים  
והוי נשיהם מצריות עמוניות מואביות ומיזמסי בני ישמעאל  
ובני קטורה ולכן יחד הכתוב על שאל בני שמעון ושאל  
בן הכנעני וכ' . . .
5. See GEN.24<sup>3</sup> - that Abraham instructed Eliezer, his  
servant, not to take a Canaanite woman for Isaac; see  
GEN.28<sup>8</sup>. cf. Bab.Tal.Pes.50<sup>a</sup>; GEN. Rabbah 85, 4.  
However, Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p.643, is of the opinion  
that Judah married a Canaanite woman. See also Torah  
Shelemah, ch.20.
6. cf. LXX. Ibn Ezra points out that the Midrash of the  
Rabbis is merely in line with Prov.12<sup>16</sup> - וכן קלון ערוה -  
"But a prudent man concealeth shame".

7. - וישב - מתוך שבלבל משכבו מעלה עליו הכתוב כאלו שכבה. - Rashi  
ולמה בלבל ומלל יצוץ שכשמתה רחל נטל יעקב ממתו  
שהיתה נתונה תדיר באהל רחל, ולא בשאר אהלים ונתנה באהל  
בלהה, בא ראובן ותבץ עלבון אמו אמר, אה אחות אמי הייתה  
צרה לאימי שפחת אחות אמי תהא צרה לאימי - לכן בלבל.  
cf. Bab.Tal.Shab. 55<sup>b</sup>; GEN. Rabbah 88, 4; Siphre, Vezoth-  
ha-Beracha, Piska 347; Midrash Aggadah; Lekah-Tov;  
Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p. 605.
8. cf. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti.
9. It appears that Onkelos holds like his teachers, Rabbi  
Eliezer and Rabbi Joshua who hold (שנייה ממע) that  
Reuben indeed sinned. See Bab. Tal. Shab. 55<sup>b</sup>. See  
Midrashic Section, Group C, note 26.
10. cf. also GEN. Rabbah 87,7; Song of Songs, Rabbah, 1, 1;  
Yalk. Shimoni 146; Tanhuma Vayeshev, 9; Sechel Tov;  
Lekah-Tov; Mishnat Rabbi Eliezer, ch.20, p. 368;  
Mechilta, Rabbi Shimon Ben Yohai, EX.35<sup>22</sup>; Midrash  
Aggadah, v.1, p. 87. See Midrashic Section, Group C,  
note 20.
11. Rashi - לעשות מלאכתו - רב ושמואל, חד אמר מלאכתו ממע  
ומד אמר לעשות ערכין עמה מלא שנה אירע לו  
דמורד דיוקנו של אביו.

Ps. Jonathan also follows Rab.

GROUP B

12. Rashi - ויתנכר אליהם - נעשה להם כנכרי בדבריהם  
לדבר קשות.
13. Rashi - ויהנכלו - נתמלאו נכלים וצר מומיוֹר
14. See Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch.3, Free Translation.
15. The Pentateuch with Rashi's Commentary. N.E.B.  
paraphrases the text.
16. cf. EX.21<sup>14</sup> - וכי יויד איש על רעהו להרגו בערמה -  
"But if a man has the presumption to kill another by  
treachery etc....."  
Onkelos translates - בנכר לו - by - בערמה -
17. Perhaps Onkelos also had in mind the verse NUM.23<sup>23</sup> -  
"there is no divination in  
Jacob".
18. - כי נחש ינחש - הלא ידעת כי איש חשוב כמון יודע לנחש  
ולרעה מרעה ומסבירא וב'נה כי אתה גנבתם  
הגביע.

NOTESGROUP B

19. While in LEV.19<sup>26</sup> and DEUT.18<sup>10</sup>, Onkelos translates  
 - נחש - literally, with regard to GEN.30<sup>27</sup> - נחשתי -  
 "I have divined that the Eternal hath blessed me for  
 thy sake" - Onkelos translates - גִּסְתִּי - "I have proved".  
 The question is why did not he translate it literally?  
 And especially since it was Laban who was a diviner.  
 There was no point in Onkelos covering up for Laban as  
 he did for the Patriarchs, for in the Midrashic  
 literature Laban was known as "a wicked person". See  
 Ginzberg, Legends, v.5, p. 302; v.6, p. 123 ff. In  
 DEUT.26<sup>5</sup> - אֲרֻמִּי אֲבִד אָבִי - "A straying Syrian was  
 my father" - Onkelos interprets - לְבָן אֲרַמְיָא -  
 - אֲבִי אֲרַמְיָא לְבָן אֲרַמְיָא - "Laban the Syrian wanted  
 to destroy my father". cf. also Ps. Jonathan and the  
 Haggadah for Passover. A. Sperber and N. Adler, quote  
 no other version to Onkelos' text on GEN.30<sup>27</sup>. Rashi,  
 who most probably realised this difficulty in Onkelos  
 interprets - נחשתי - נחשתי בנחוש שלי, שעל ידך באה לי ברכה.  
 "I have tested, i.e. discovered by my act of divination  
 that through you a blessing has come to me". It appears  
 that Rashi understands that the Targum did not cover up  
 for Laban. However, the question remains why did not he  
 translate it literally, as he did in LEV.19<sup>26</sup> and DEUT.18<sup>10</sup>.  
 I believe, however, that Onkelos refused to translate it  
 literally in connection with Laban, simply because of the

NOTESGROUP B

## 19. (cont'd)

continuation of the verse :- נחשתי וברכני ה' בגלליך

"I divined and the Lord blessed me for your sake".

Out of reverence to God, Onkelos plays it down for how can a diviner be blessed by God? See M. Levenstein, Nephesh, Hager, op. cit. pp. 144-145.

20. cf. Neofiti: - שמעון ולוי אחין תלמין מרי זינה שטנה עברי קרב  
מן שליותיהון בארץ בצלי רבביהון עברי נצחט קרב'יהון -  
cf. also the Palest. Targum.

21. cf. GEN.49<sup>14</sup> - יִשָּׂכָר חֲמֹר יִשְׁכָּר - To compare Issachar to a bony ass is certainly uncomplimentary. Onkelos, therefore, translates: - יִשְׁכָּר עֲתִיר בְּנִכְסִין - Issachar is rich in substance. See S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, p. 74. Neofiti also tones it down - יִשְׁכָּר -  
- שבט רדקיף - cf. Ps. Jonathan. See Midrashic Section, Group B, note 6.

22. The Samaritan text reads: - אֶרֶר - instead of - אֶרֶר -  
See A. Geiger, Hamikra ve-Targumav, op. cit. p. 241.

NOTESVENERATION AND IDEALIZATION OF THE PROPHET MOSESGROUP C

1. - האשה הנשית - מגיד שהכל מוריד בידיה בשם שהכל  
מוריד בעשרותיו של כושי  
cf. Siphre, Piska 99; Yalk. Shimoni, 738; Pirke Rabbi  
Eliezer, ch. 53; Midrash Aggadah; Yalk. Jer. 326;  
Aboth Derabi Nathan, ch.9. (נוסחה א.), Vienna  
1887, S.Z. Schechter, p.122; cf. Palest. Targum and  
Neofiti. However, Ps. Jonathan takes it literally.  
See Midrashic Section, Group C, note 47.
2. cf. Rashi - כשית- בגימטריא יפת מראה מעבוננו של  
זה כמעבוננו של זה וכו' -
3. In Amos 9<sup>7</sup> - Jonathan translates - כבני כש"י - by  
- "merciful sons" - הלא כבני רחמין -
4. N.E.B. in fact, takes it in this sense: "I will take  
back part of that same spirit which has been conferred  
on you and confer it on them...." cf. N.E.B. NUM.11<sup>25</sup>.
5. cf. Rabbi A. Ibn Ezra: - ואצלתי - וקצ כי הרוח כמו החכמה ואם  
תנתן מחכמת ראובן לשמעון לא תחסר חכמת ראובן רק נשארה באשר היא  
והמשל בגר  
See also Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch.1, note 24.
6. See Siphre Bebaalotecha, Piska 95, cf. Tanhuma Buber,  
v.2, p. 57: - נדכנבאו לפי שעה ופסקו -



7. cf. Bab. Tal. Sanh. 17<sup>a</sup> - .... בשעה שאמר לו הקב"ה  
למשה.... שהנביאים כולן נתנבאו ופסקו והם  
(אלרד ומידר) נתנבאו ולא פסקו. -  
L. Ginzberg, Legends, v.6, p.88, note 481. See also  
Midrashic Section, Group A, note 25.
8. Ps. Jonathan and Palest. Targum translate literally.
9. See N. Adler, Netinah-Lager.
10. cf. NUM. 12<sup>9</sup> - והנה מרים מצרעת כשלג -  
Here, too, Onkelos deletes the word - מצרעת -  
and thus he says - "And והא מרים חורא כתלגא -  
Miriam is as white as snow".
11. Rashi explains - מצרעת כשלג - דרך צרעת להיות לבנה -  
It is the nature of leprosy to be white. It appears  
from his statement that the word - כשלג - in the  
text is superfluous, for the comparison between a  
leprous hand and "snow" is self-evident.

NOTESVENERATION OF AARON, THE PRIESTS AND THE PEOPLE OF ISRAELGROUP D

1. The Pentateuch with Rashi's Commentary. N.E.B. however, translates: "Then Aaron was afraid and built an altar in front of it and issued this proclamation".
2. See LEV. Rabbah 10, 3; Pesikta de Rabbi Kahana. S. Buber, p. 133<sup>b</sup>.
3. cf. DEUT.12<sup>3</sup> - "וּנְתַרְצֵרְתָּם אֶת מִזְבְּחֵיהֶם" - "And you shall pull down their altars". Onkelos translates - וְתִרְצִין יִת - אֲגוּרֵיהוֹן. cf. too, Ps. Jonathan; cf. also Onkelos, EX.34<sup>13</sup>; DEUT.7<sup>5</sup>.
4. See J. Komlosch - "קווי" אובני" בתרגום אונקלוס תדפיס מתוך שנתון בר מילן כרך ו' תשכ"ח. v.6, 1968, p. 188. cf. also EX.4<sup>14</sup>, where Rashi idealizes Aaron for not being jealous in seeing his brother Moses attaining a high position.
5. - וְיִזְכָּר רָאָה וְאָמַר אֵם הֵם בּוֹנֵים אוֹתוֹ הַמִּזְבֵּחַ, זֶה מִבְּיַד צֹרֵר וְזֶה מִבְּיַד אֲבִן וְנִמְצְאָה מִלְּאֲכָתָן נִעְשִׂית בְּבֵית אֲחִית, מִתּוֹךְ שֶׁאֵם בּוֹנֶה אוֹתוֹ וְאֵם מִתְּעַצֵּר בְּמִלְּאֲכָתָן! בֵּין כֵּן וּבֵין כֵּן מִשְׁרֵה בֵּא וְכוּ...  
cf. LEV. Rabbah 10,3; Yalk. Shimon 391,32; Midrash Hagadol, EX. p. 680.

6. - ויחזו- היו מסתכלין בו בלב גס מתוך אכילה ושתייה, כן מורש  
תנחומא ואונקלוס לא תרגם בן.  
cf. also LEV. Rabbah 20, 10; Bab.Tal.Ber.17<sup>a</sup>. See  
General Introduction, p.36ff; Midrashic Section, Group B,  
note 11.
7. - וחזו ית יקרא דה' והו מן בקרבניהון דאפקבלו באלו אכלין ושרבין  
cf. Ps. Jonathan.
8. Depending on the context, in some instances, Onkelos  
translates the word "Cohen" as - שמע - "minister",  
which is, in fact, apparently sometimes its meaning,  
e.g. GEN.14<sup>18</sup> - והוא כהן לאל ערליין - "And he  
was a priest of the Most High God". Onkelos translates  
- והוא משמע קוד אל עלמה - cf. also EX.28<sup>3</sup>.
9. cf. GEN.47<sup>22</sup> - רק אדמת הכהנים - Onkelos  
translates - לומר מנעא דכומריא - cf. GEN.47<sup>26</sup>.
10. - הכהנים- הכומרים, כל לשון כהן משרת לאלהות הוא חוץ  
מאותן שהם לשון גדולה כמו כהן מדיין  
כהן און.  
cf. Rashi on EX.2<sup>16</sup>, where Rashi translates - ולכהן -  
by - רב שברין - the Chief amongst them;  
cf. II. Sam. 8<sup>18</sup>, where Rashi follows Jonathan :-  
ובני דוד רברבין הו - by - ובני דוד כהנים היו -

NOTESGROUP D

11. In all these cases, GEN.14<sup>18</sup>; GEN.41<sup>45</sup>; GEN.47<sup>22</sup>; GEN.47<sup>26</sup>; and EX.3<sup>1</sup>. Ps. Jonathan follows Onkelos. However, the Palest. Targum on GEN.14<sup>18</sup> reads:-

- וּמַשְׁמֵט בְּכֹהֵן גָּדוֹל בְּיָדָא -

"And serves in the High priesthood". cf. Neofiti.

12. Ps. Jonathan reads:- דָּא עָמַד דְּהוּ טַפְשִׁין וְקָבִילוּ  
אֲרִיכָא וְלֹא חֲבִימוּ -

cf. Neofiti:- דָּא אָמַר טַפְשָׁה וְלֹא חֲבִימִין -

Out of respect for the people of Israel, Onkelos refused to use the term - מַפְשִׁין - as the other Targumim do.

13. For more examples of this/<sup>kind</sup>see, Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch. 3, Free Translation, notes 16 and 17.

NOTESRASHI AND PS. JONATHAN'S TARGUM

1. See B.J. Roberts, The Old Testament Texts and Versions, Cardiff, 1951, p.201 ff. This Targum is dated in the 7th century A.D. mainly because it contains mention of the names of Muhamed's wife and daughter. See L. Zunz, Haderashot Be-Israel, pp.36-38. A.Geiger, Hamikra ve-Targumav, pp. 290-293.
2. cf. EX.12<sup>12</sup>; GEN.1<sup>26</sup>; GEN.11<sup>7</sup>.
3. The theory of P. Churgin (Targum Ket.1945, p.112; quoted also by B.J. Roberts, op.cit.p.202) that the Jerusalem Targumim did not attempt to provide a translation but simply an exposition is incorrect as frequently these Targumim merely provide a straight translation for the biblical texts. Almost in every chapter in the Torah part of it is a Derash exposition and the other part is simply a translation.
4. See Beitrage - translated from German to Hebrew by Zeidman in Sepher-Rashi, Judah-Ben Maimon, Mossad Harav Kook, p.151. Several scholars have followed his opinion. See E.M.Lifshits, Rashi, p.108; S.A. Poznansky - מבוא על חכמי צרפת מפרשי המקרא - Jerusalem, 1965, p.18. See, however, M. Liber, Rashi, p.249, note 60 - who argues that Rashi seems to have known about the Targum

NOTES

## 4. (cont'd).

of Ps. Jonathan on the Pentateuch. See Berliner in Zechor Le-Abraham, Berlin, 1866, pp.373-374 - who believes that Rashi seems to have known about Ps. Jonathan. In fact in several places, Berliner points out that Rashi's interpretations are taken from Ps. Jonathan e.g. GEN.18<sup>29</sup>; GEN.26<sup>35</sup>; GEN.35<sup>22</sup>; GEN.42<sup>27</sup>. At this stage it may be worth mentioning that many of Berliner's examples are not convincing as the same interpretations are found in Midrash Aggadah, GEN. Rabbah and Yalk. Shimoni.

5. See Tosafoth Bab.Git. p.8<sup>a</sup>.6. cf. Ps. Jonathan NUM.20<sup>22-25</sup>; NUM.21<sup>1</sup>; NUM.33<sup>37</sup>; NUM.33<sup>41</sup>; DEUT.32<sup>50</sup>; NUM.33<sup>29</sup> - Ps. Jonathan - reads: -שׁוֹרִים אֶת־עַם-7. Neofiti, however, is inconsistent for whilst in NUM.20<sup>22-25</sup> he translates like Onkelos - לָהֶם מִן־הָאֵשׁ - (cf. NUM.33<sup>37-38</sup>) here in NUM.34<sup>7-8</sup> he translates - לִמְנוּחֵיהֶם -

## 8. cf. Palest. Targum.

9. cf. Bab.Tal. Shab.p.155<sup>b</sup> - we may unite bundles of straw - מפרכין תבן -
10. A. Berliner, of course, has not seen the Neofiti Targum.
11. Parasha 61, 5. See footnote 16.
12. See A. Ibn Ezra.
13. Ps. Jonathan translates - אמפורין; Palest. Targum translates - ואומנין - GEN. Rabbah, ibid, translates - לופרין. In Bereshit-Zuta, Rabbi Samuel Ben Nissim, Mossad Harav Kook, Jerusalem, 1962, p.179, the reading is - לפידין -
14. See M. Jastrow, Dictionary, v.II, p. 700.
15. See Rashi, GEN.25<sup>3</sup> who rejects Onkelos' interpretation.
16. Some scholars, however, cast doubts as to whether Rashi has written this commentary on GEN. Rabbah. See E.M. Lifshitz, "Rashi", p.194. See, however, "Sepher Haorah of Rashi", v.2. ch.63, where the following statement is mentioned:- חמרת ימים אותו קראת, היכן נקרא שבת חמרה - שנאמר וכל אלמים ביום השביעי - בתרגום ירושלמי - וחמרת ביומא שביעאה .

## 16. (cont'd)

The same statement is found in "Machzor Vitry", ch.103. Most probably Rashi and his disciples had other texts of Jerusalem Targum for this interpretation is not found in Ps. Jonathan or in Neofiti. cf. also Rashi GEN.

Rabbah - (Parasha 33,3) - GEN.38<sup>27</sup> - where Rashi quotes once again the "Jerusalem Targum":-

אֲשׁוּנָה - הוֹאֵץ, תְּרוּגוֹן  
יְרוּשָׁלַיִם בֵּץ לְדָתָהּ, וְהָיָה בְּאֲשׁוּנָה דְּמִילְדָה

Here, too, Rashi must have had a different text for Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti translate differently.

17. In EX.28<sup>4</sup> Rashi quotes Jonathan by name but on the whole he just says - "Understand it as the Targum", e.g. GEN.45<sup>26</sup>; EX.27<sup>10</sup>; EX.30<sup>13</sup>; EX.38<sup>8</sup>; NUM.31<sup>10</sup>; DEUT.33<sup>19</sup>. See chapter, Rashi and Jonathan's Targum on the Prophets.

18. See Bab.Tal.Meg. 3<sup>a</sup>.

19. On this particular text, see Mechilta Parashat Beshalach, Massechta 2, Parasha 6; Maimonides, Guide to the Perplexed, v.1. ch.2; section, Anthropomorphisms, Group 1. References Exposed to Polytheistic Interpretation, note 1. A. Berliner in Zechor Le-Abraham believes that Rashi's source is Ps. Jonathan.



20. Onkelos and Neofiti translate literally.
21. It is true, however, that this interpretation is also found in Pirke de-Rabbi Eliezer, ch.21 and in Midrash Hagadol, GEN. Mossad Harav Kook, op.cit. p.124. But since Rashi did not quote his sources, it may well be that the source of his interpretation is Ps. Jonathan. A. Berliner, Zechor Le-Abraham, quotes Ps. Jonathan as Rashi's source.
22. Onkelos translates - **וידא דבט אנשא יהון צריכין ליה** -  
Neofiti - **וידא כלל ישלטון ביה**
23. Onkelos - **ואנשי קריתא** - Neofiti - **דקריתא**
24. Onkelos and Neofiti translates literally.
25. Perhaps, however, Rashi's source is Midrash Aggadah, v.1, p.58: **בקע משקלו - כנגד בקע לגלגלה, ושע צמידו, כנגד שע לוחו מבנה** - cf. Rabbi Samuel Ben Nissim, p.170.
26. Onkelos translates - **אתא גדה** ; Palest. Targum and Neofiti translate - **אתא גדה מוא**

27. cf. Palest. Targum and Neofiti. Onkelos translates - נַטְרִירָה - for שְׁמִירָה. See, Veneration and Idealization of the Patriarchs and the Matriarchs, Group A, note 10.
28. Onkelos and Neofiti translate literally - וְקָרָא לְאַחֲרָיו -
29. Onkelos and Neofiti translate literally. See also Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch.10, Rashi and the Text of Onkelos, notes 14 and 15 - where Rashi appears to follow Ps. Jonathan.
30. Neofiti, Ps. Jonathan, GEN. Rabbah, Tanhuma and other Midrashim do not take - וְשָׁרָה - as a reference to Joseph.
31. cf. Palest. Targum. Neofiti and Onkelos translate literally. Several commentators believe that Rashi's source is either the Palest. Targum or Ps. Jonathan.
32. See Rashi, LEV.14<sup>14</sup> - וְהָיָה כְּתֹנֶן - it is the inner wall of the ear. cf. Ps. Jonathan - וְהָיָה כְּתֹנֶן. Rashi's translation once again, is identical with that of Ps. Jonathan. See Bab.Tal. Besh. p.37<sup>a</sup> and p.40<sup>b</sup>; Pes.84<sup>a</sup>. Perhaps, however, Rashi's

NOTES

32. (cont'd).

source is the Siphra, Parashat Metsora, Piska 50 -

ונתן על תנוך - יכול על תוך ודא ת"ל על נוך, א על נוך יכול על  
גובה של ארון ת"ל תוך נוך, הא כיצד זה גדר האמצעי.

The Pesikta Zutratī appears to follow Onkelos -

תנוך - זה גדר האמצעי הקרוב לגובה של ארון -

cf. Adler, Netinah-Lager on EX.29<sup>20</sup>.

33. cf. Neofiti. Onkelos translates literally - וקר א

ל. Perhaps, however, Rashi had in mind the Derash

- NUM. Rabbah 16, 21 - מלמד שבין זרקין אבנע והען מקבל -

Hence the dependence is not on Ps. Jonathan, cf. Bab.Tal.

Sot. p.35<sup>a</sup>.

34. Several Midrashim take "princes" to mean, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and only Ps. Jonathan (see Palest.Targum Neofiti) interprets it to mean Moses and Aaron. The Midrash Hagadol, NUM. Mossad Harav Kook, op.cit. p.390 takes "princes" to mean Moses and the 70 Elders.

According to Z.M. Rabinowitz Rashi's source is - מדרש

אוריית דרבי עקיבא השלם - pp.384-385. Most likely

Rashi has not seen this Midrash, and furthermore, this

Midrash mentions Moses only and not Aaron as Rashi does.

35. Neofiti explains that Elazar will guide Joshua regarding the laws of the Torah - וְיֵשׁעֵל לִיה כִּסֹּדֶר -

דִּינֵיהוֹן לְאוֹרֵיתָה קֹדֶם ה' -

cf. Onkelos:- וְיֵשׁעֵל לִיה בְּדִין אוֹרֵי קֹדֶם ה' -

While the rest of Rashi's interpretation is found in Tanhuma and Bab. Tal.Sanh.16<sup>a</sup> - this particular interpretation is only found in Ps. Jonathan. This point was also noted by A. Bromberg who also believed that Rashi has seen Ps. Jonathan. (See Sinai, v.57, 1965, p.91). Asa Kasher, (see Sinai, v.58, 1966, pp. 91-93) however, argues that there is no proof from here that Rashi's source is Ps. Jonathan as the phraseology - גִּלְפִּי - is self-evident that the text speaks about "war". But it might be contended that despite the occurrence of the phrase, military guidance - which has already been referred to in v.17 - is not here referred to, since the text can be explained in the sense of Neofiti Targum: that is to say that Elazar, the priest will guide Joshua in "matters of law" which was in fact the function of a priest in those days.

36. Onkelos and Neofiti translate literally.

NOTES

37. cf. Palest. Targum - קטלו חבימין בית קטליה ספרק ראשא עז מרעא -  
cf. also Neofiti.
38. cf. Neofiti.
39. This is also the interpretation of the Rabbis in  
Mechilta, Beshalach, Masechta 4, Parasha 5; cf. Midrash  
Hagadol EX. Mossad Harav Kook, op.cit. p. 335. See  
M. Friedmann in his commentary on the Mechilta, who  
quotes Ps. Jonathan as Rashi's source.
40. cf. also the Palest. Targum and Neofiti:-  
- נשוי עילן מלך ונחזור למצריים -
41. The Pentateuch with Rashi's Commentary. N.E.B. reads:-  
"and enjoy the wife he has taken".
42. See A. Bromberg, Sinai, v.57, op.cit. p.91; N. Adler  
Netinah-Lager; S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger, p.82, however,  
bring another version in Onkelos where the reading is  
-ע- and consequently, Rashi is refuting Onkelos.  
The reading in Neofiti - ו'ר' ית ארר' - supports  
Rashi. Perhaps Ps. Jonathan had in his biblical text  
- ע'ר! - the Pe'al and not - ע'ר! - the Piel. Hence he  
translates - ע'ר - cf. David Rider, Sinai, v.58, op.cit. p.94.

43. We need not here concern ourselves with whether Rashi was criticising an incorrectly vocalised targumic text, or an oral tradition of pronunciation associated with written targumic texts lacking vowel signs. See Section, *Rashi as Philologist* ch. 9 note 6 p. 410
44. cf. Jonathan on the Prophets, Jer. ch. 5<sup>19</sup>.
45. See Sinai v. 57, op. cit. p. 91.
46. Neofiti translates literally - ותפלחון תמן טעון אחרנין
47. See further A. Bromberg, Sinai, v. 57, op. cit. p. 91 - who quotes Rashi on NUM. 5<sup>10</sup> - איש אשר יתן לכהן לו יהיה - "whatever is given to the priest shall be his". Rashi interprets - לו יהיה - ממון הרבה - He shall have great riches. Bromberg believes that Rashi's source is Ps. Jonathan: - ולא חסרין נכסיו גבר מה דיתן לכהנא דיגליה יהי
- In this particular instance Rashi's source is certainly not Ps. Jonathan, but rather Bab. Tal. Ber. 63<sup>a</sup> where the same notion is mentioned: - אמר רב נחמן בר יצחק ואם נתנן סוף מתעשר שנאמר איש אשר יתן לכהן לו יהיה - לו יהיה ממון הרבה
48. A. Bromberg believes that Rashi's source on DEUT. 32<sup>13-14</sup> is Ps. Jonathan. On this particular text see Midrashic Section, Group B, note 21.

NOTESRASHI AND JONATHAN'S TARGUM ON THE PROPHETS

1. cf. EX.28<sup>4</sup> - אומר לי לבי שהוא מן לבוש שדרגס יונתן...  
Quite frequently, however, Rashi does not quote him by name e.g. GEN. 45<sup>26</sup>; EX.27<sup>10</sup>; EX.30<sup>13</sup>; EX.38<sup>8</sup>; NUM.31<sup>10</sup>; DEUT.33<sup>19</sup>. See chapter, Rashi and Ps. Jonathan's Targum, footnote 17.
2. See Bab.Tal.Meg.3<sup>a</sup>. On this Talmudical statement see P. Churgin, Targum Jonathan to the Prophets, New Haven, 1927 in his introduction, The Historical Background, pp. 9-20 (especially p.14). See also Introduction to the Halachic Section.
3. cf.. Nahum 1<sup>12</sup> - יפה תרגום של יונתן מיושב על המקרא -  
Malachi 1<sup>15</sup> - ותרגום של יונתן הוכשר בעיני -
4. cf. Ez.16<sup>9</sup> - וינתן פירש את כולה ואין להוסיף על התרגום -
5. cf. Rashi, Jud.5<sup>4</sup> - בצאתך משעיר - זה מתן תורה וכו' וכל זה יש -  
ללמוד מתרגומו של יונתן
6. cf. Rashi, Nah. 1<sup>12</sup> - אם שלמים - יפה תרגום של יונתן מיושב -  
על המקרא וכו' ורבותינו רשו לעטן מעשה הצדקה במסכת גיטין אך אינו  
על סדר שאר הנבואה.  
ישאר - ויש פותרין על כי האגדה שנתקבצו -  
נשאי העכו"ם אל הנביא וכו'.. ותרגום של יונתן הוכשר בעיני...

7. cf. DEUT.19<sup>5</sup>.
8. cf. Rashi, Zech.1<sup>1</sup> - נבואת זכריה סתומה היא מאד כי יש בה מראות דומות לחלום העתק לפיתרון וכו'.. ולפי היכולת אתן לב ליישב במקראות אחד אחד מן הפירושים הדומות לו ואחר פירושים של יונתן.
9. cf. Rashi DEUT.3<sup>4</sup> - חבל ארגון - מתרגמין בית פלך טרכונא, ולאיתי' תרגום ירושלמי במגילת אסתר קורא פלשין טרכונין - זכה - בתרגום של מגילה - See also Rashi Bab.Tal.Meg.13 - מייחס מרדכי ופושטו עשירי לשאול וכו'..
10. See Rashi Bab.Tal.Meg.21<sup>b</sup> - ופושטו מתרגמין לא גרסינן טאין - תרגום בכתובים.
- However, in Bab.Tal.Taa. p.18<sup>a</sup>, Rashi quotes the Targum on the Hagiographa - הפג'נו - צעקו כן מתרגמין בתהלים - כל לשון שועה וצעקה לשון פג'נה.
- See L. Zunz Hadershot Be-Israel, Jerusalem 1974, p.253, note 17. Also Rashi Psalms, 74, v.19.
11. Some scholars believe that Rab. Joseph is the author of the Targum on the Hagiographa. See Rabbi Samuel Ben Meir in his commentary on the Torah, EX.15<sup>2</sup>; LEV.20<sup>17</sup>. However, the Tosafoth, Shab.115<sup>a</sup> reject this opinion.



## 11. (cont'd)

cf. also Tosafoth Bab.Kam.p.3<sup>b</sup>; Meg.p.21<sup>b</sup>. See also Haderashot Be-Israel, *ibid*, p.253, note 21. Rashi, however, possessed a "Palestinian Targum" on the Book of Micah the Prophet. (See Rashi Micah,ch.7<sup>3</sup>). Rabbi David Kamhi in his commentary on the Book of Ezekiel, ch.5<sup>1</sup> quote also the Palestinian Targum. See Zunz, p.39. The quotations of the Targum to Psalms, some of them taken from Rashi's commentary, by Herbert of Bosham (late 12th century) would indicate either very early interpolation or - more probably - that Rashi did know a Targum to Psalms even if not to the remainder of the Hagiographa. See R. Loewe, Biblica, 34, 1953, pp. 67-68.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ABELSON, J.           The Immanence of God in Rabbinical Literature, London, 1912.
- ALEXANDER, P.S.    The Rabbinic Lists of Forbidden Targumim. J.J.S. Volume 27, No. 2, Autumn, 1976, pp. 177-191.
- ALTMANN, A.        Saadia Gaon, The Book of Doctrines and Beliefs, Phaidon Press, Oxford.
- BAARS, W.           A Targum on Exodus XV, 7-21 from the Cairo Geniza, VT 11, 1961, pp. 340-342.
- BACHER, W.         Agada der Tannaiten, No. 1-2, Strasburg, 1884-1890.
- Die Agada der Palästinen'sischen Amoräer, No. 1-3, Strasburg, 1892, 1896, 1899.
- Die Agada der Babylonischen Amoräer, Frankfurt, 1913.  
(Translated - see Hebrew Section).
- BAER, Y.            The Early Elements of the Halacha, Zion 17, 1952. (See Hebrew Section).
- BARON, S.W.         Social and Religious History of the Jews, Nos. 1-10. Second edition, New York, 1958.
- BARON, F.
- DRIVER, S.R.        A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1929.
- BRIGGS, C.A.        (First edition, 1906).

- BELKIN, S. Philo and the Oral Law, Cambridge, Mass, 1940.
- BERLINER, A. Targum Onkelos, Berlin, 1884 (Jerusalem, 1968).
- Beitrage Zur Geschichte der Rashi  
Commentare, Berlin, 1902.
- BLACK, M. An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and  
Acts, Oxford, 1967.
- BLOCH, R. Note Sur L'utilisation des Fragments de  
la Geniza du Caire pour l'etude du Targum  
Palestinien, REJ (Revue des Etudes Juives)  
14 (114), 1955, pp. 1-35.
- BOWKER, J.W. The Targum and Rabbinic Literature,  
Cambridge, 1969.
- Haggadah in the Targum Onkelos, J.S.S. 12,  
1967, pp. 51-65.
- BOX, G.H. The Ideas of Intermediation in Jewish  
Theology, J.Q.R. 23, 1932-33, pp. 103-119.
- CHURGIN, P. Targum Jonathan to the Prophets, Yale  
University Press, New-Haven, 1927.
- The Targum and the Septuagint, A.J.S.L.  
(American Journal of Semitics Languages  
and Literature) 50, 1933-34, pp. 41-65.
- The Targum of the Hagiographa, New York,  
1945. (See Hebrew Section).

- COHEN, B. Law and Ethics in the Light of Jewish Tradition, 1957.
- DAN, J. "Shechinah" (in Kabbalah) Encyclopaedia Judaica, Keter, v.14, pp.1353-54.
- DEI-ROSSI  
AZARIAH. See Hebrew Section.
- DRIVER, S.R. An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, New York, 1913.
- ELBOGEN, I. Der Jüdische Gottesdienst in Seiner Geschichtlichen Entwicklung, Leipzig, 1913. (Translated - see Hebrew Section).
- EISSFELDT, O. The Old Testament, an Introduction, translated by Peter R. Ackroyd, Oxford Basil Blackwell, 1966.
- EMERTON, J.A. A Consideration of Some Alleged Meanings of -  $\gamma\tau$  - in Hebrew, J.S.S.15, 1970, pp.145-180.
- EPSTEIN, A. Tosefta du Targoum Yerouschalmi, R.E.J. (Revue des Etudes Juives) 30, 1895, pp.44-51.
- FILIPOWSKI, H. The First Hebrew and Chaldaic Lexicon by Menachem Ben Seruk, London, 1854.
- FINKELSTEIN, L. Studies in the Tannaitic Midrashim, P.A.A.J.R. (Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research). 6, 1934-35, pp.189-228.

- FRANKEL, I. Peshat in Talmudic and Midrashic Literature, Toronto La Salle Press, 1956.
- FREUDENTHAL, J. Are There Traces of Greek Philosophy in the Septuagint? J.Q.R.II, pp.205-222.
- FRITSCH, Ch.T. The Anti-Anthropomorphisms of the Greek Pentateuch, Princeton, New Jersey, 1943.
- GEIGER, A. Urschrift und Übersetzungen Der Bibel in Ihrer Abhängigkeit von der Innern Entwicklung des Judentums, Breslau, 1857. (Second edition 1928) see Hebrew Section.
- GERTNER, M. Terms of Scriptural Interpretation: A Study in Hebrew Semantics, Bulletin of the London School of Oriental and African Studies, XXV, 1. 1962, p.18 ff.
- GESENIUS, W. Hebrew Grammar, Oxford, 1946-49. Edited and enlarged by E. Kautzsch, Oxford University Press, 1946-49.
- GINZBERG, L. Legends of the Jews, Philadelphia, 1-7, 1912-46.
- GOLB, M. History and Culture of the Jews of Rouen in the Middle Ages, Tel Aviv, 1976.
- GORDON, R.P. The Citation of the Targums in Recent English Bible Translations. (R.S.V. J.B. N.E.B. J.J.S. Volume 26, Nos. 1-2, Spring/Autumn, 1975, pp. 50-60.

- GRELOT, P. Une Tosefta Targoumique sur Genese,  
XXII. R.E.J. (Revue des Etudes Juives)  
16, 106, 1957, pp. 5-26.
- Les Targums du Pentateuque Genese, IV,  
3-16, Semitica 9, 1959, pp. 59-88.
- GROSSFELD, B. Ancient Versions: The Targumim,  
Encyclopaedia Judaica, Keter, 1972,  
v.4, pp. 841-850.
- Targum Onkelos and Rabbinic Interpretation  
to Genesis 21-2, J.J.S.v.24, No.2, Autumn  
1973, pp. 176-78.
- GROSSMAN, A. Samuel Ben Meir (Rashbam), Encyclopaedia  
Judaica, Keter, 1972, v.14, p. 810.
- HEINEMANN, I. Kuzari, Judah Halevi, 3 Jewish Philosophers,  
published by Meridian Books and the Jewish  
Publication Society, Philadelphia. Second  
printing, July 1961.
- HEINEMANN, J. Early Halacha in the Palestinian Targumim,  
J.J.S. No.25, 1974, pp. 114-122.
- HIRSCH, S.A. Rashi as an Exegete The Kabbalists, London,  
1922, pp. 139-166.
- HORWITZ, R.G. "Shechinah" (in Jewish Philosophy)  
Encyclopaedia Judaica, Keter, v.14, pp.  
1352-53.

- HUSIK, I. A History of Medieval Jewish Philosophy, The Jewish Publication of America, Philadelphia, 1946.
- JACKSON, B.S. A Note on Exodus 22<sup>4</sup>, J.J.S. v.27, No.2, Autumn 1976, pp.138-141.
- JACOBS, L. The Development of Halacha, Encyclopaedia Judaica, Keter, v.7, p. 1161 ff.
- JASTROW, M. Dictionary of Talmud Babli Yerushalmi Midrashic Literature and Targumim, vol.1-2, Pardes Publishing House, New York 1950.
- JOSEPHUS, F. Antiquities of the Jews (translated by William Whiston, published by George Routledge and Sons), London, N.D.
- KADUSHIN, M. Rabbinic Mind, New York, 1952.
- A Conceptual Approach to the Mechilta - The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, New York, 1969.
- KAHLE, P. The Cairo Geniza, Oxford, (second edition) 1959.
- KLEIN, M. The Targumic Tosefta to Exodus 15<sup>2</sup>. J.S.S. v.26, Nos.1-2, Spring/Autumn 1975, pp.61-67.
- KOHLER, K. Jewish Theology, New York, 1928.
- KOMLOSH, J. Targum Sheni, Encyclopaedia Judaica, Keter, 1972, v.15, p. 811.
- Exegetical Peculiarities in the Onkelos Targum. Proceedings of the 27th International Congress of Orientalists, Wiesbaden 1971, pp.105-106.

- KUIPER, G.J.      The Pseudo-Jonathan Targum and its  
Relationship to Targum Onkelos,  
Gregorian University Press, Rome 1972.
- LAUTERBACH, J.Z.      Midrash and Mishna in his Rabbinic  
Essays, 1951, pp.163-256.
- LE DEAUT, R.      Introduction a la Literature  
Targoumique, Rome, 1966.
- LEVIN, E.      A Paleographic note on the Colophon of  
MS Neofiti 1, VT.21, 1972, pp.494-497.
- LEVY, S.H.      The Date of Targum Jonathan to the  
Prophets, VT 21, 1971, pp.186-196.
- LIBER, M.      Rashi, translated from the French by  
Adele Szold, first edition Jewish  
Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1906.  
Reprinted Herman Press, New York 1970.
- LIEBERMAN, S.      Hellenism in Jewish Palestine, New York 1950.
- LOEWE, R.      Apologetic Motifs in the Targum to the  
Song of Songs, vol. Biblical Motifs,  
pp. 159-196.
- Jerome's Treatment of an Anthopoopathism -  
Vetus Testamentum, Leider (E.J. Brill)  
1952, pp.261-272.



- LOEWE, R.      The Plain Meaning of Scripture in Early Jewish Exegesis. Papers of the Institute of Jewish Studies, London, vol. 1. Edited by J.G. Weiss, Magnes Press, Jerusalem 1964, pp. 140-185.
- Herbert of Bosham's Commentary on Jerome's Hebrew Psalter .Biblica, vol. 34, Rome, 1953, pp. 159-192.
- MACHO, A.DÍEZ      The Recently Discovered Palestinian Targum: Supplement VII, Vetus Testamentum, Oxford, 1959. Leiden, 1960, pp. 222-245.
- Nuevos Fragmentos del Targum Palestinense, Sefarad 15, 1956, pp. 31-39.
- Un Manuscrito Babilónico de Onkelos, Sefarad 19, 1959, pp. 273-282.
- Primeros Impresas del Targum de Onkelos, Sefarad 30, 1970, pp. 289-303.
- MARMORSTEIN, A.      The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God. (Jews' College Publication No. 14) London, 1937.

- MAC-NAMARA, M. The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum, Rome, 1966.
- Targumic Studies, C.B.Q. (Catholic Biblical Quarterly) 28, 1966, pp. 1-19.
- MONTEFIORE, C.G.  
& LOEWE, H. A Rabbinic Anthology (Meridian Books), Philadelphia, 1963.
- MELAMED, R.H. The Targum to Canticles According to Yemen - MSS. Philadelphia, 1921.
- MENDOZA, J.P. Rashi as Philologist, Manchester University Press, 1940.
- MONTGOMERY, J.A. The "Place" as an Appellation of Deity, Journal of Biblical Literature, 24, 1905, pp. 17-26.
- MOORE, G.F. Judaism, v.1. Cambridge, 1927.
- Intermediaries in Jewish Theology, Harvard Theological Review, XV, 1922, pp. 41-85.
- NICKELS, P. Targum and New Testament. A Bibliography, Rome, 1967.

OE. STERLEY, W.O.E.

& BOX, G.M. A short Survey of the Literature of  
Rabbinical and Medieval Judaism,  
London, 1920.

PFEIFFER, R.H. Introduction to the Old Testament,  
New York, 1948.

RABINOWITZ, L. "Peshat"-Encyclopaedia Judaica, Keter, 1972,  
v.13, p. 329.

— Onkelos and Aquila, Encyclopaedia Judaica,  
Keter, 1972, v.12, p.1405.

— The Social Life of the Jews of Northern  
France in the 12-14th centuries, Edward  
Goldston, London, 1938.

ROBERTS, B.J. The Old Testament Text and Versions,  
Cardiff, 1951.

ROSENBLATT, S. Bible Interpretation in the Mishna,  
Baltimore, 1935.

ROSIN, D. Rabbi Samuel Ben Meir (Rashbam), Jahresbericht  
des Jüdisch -Theologischen Seminars,  
Breslau, 1880.

— Rashbam's Commentary, Breslau, 1881.

- ROWLANDS, E.R. The Targum and the Peshitta Version of  
The Book of Isaiah, VT 9, 1959, pp. 178-191.
- ROWLEY, H.H. The Servant of the Lord, London, 1954.
- SCHECHTER, S. Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology,  
New York, 1909.
- SCHOLEM, G.G. Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism (Schocken  
Books), New York, 1967.
- SHUMARY, Y. Avoidance of Anthropomorphism in the  
Targum of Psalms. Textus 5, 1966, pp. 133-144.
- SILVERSTONE, E.E. Aquila and Onkelos, 1931.
- SINGER, S. Onkelos u. das Verhältniß Seines Targums  
Zur Halacha, Berlin, 1884.
- SMALLEY, B. The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages,  
ch. IV Andrew of Oxford, Blackwell, 1952. St.  
Victor, p. 112 ff. with special attention to  
Herbert of Bosham, p. 186 ff.
- SOKOLOFF, M. The Targum to Job, Bar Ilan University, 1974.
- SPERBER, A. The Targum Onkelos in its Relation to the  
Massoretic Text. P. A. A. J. R. (Proceedings of  
the American Academy for Jewish Research)  
1935, pp. 309-351.
- STRACK, H.L. Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash  
(Meridian Books), New York 1959.

- STEVENSON, W.B. Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic, Oxford, 1962.
- TAKAMITSU, M. The Aramaic of the Old Targum of Job from Qumran Cave, XI, J.J.S. 25, Feb. 1974, pp. 425-443.
- TAYLOR, C. Sayings of the Jewish Fathers, Cambridge, 1877.
- THOMSON, C. The Old Testament, translated from the Septuagint, Hove, England, 1907.
- TOEG, A. EX.22<sup>4</sup> - The Text and the Law in the Light of the Ancient Sources, Tarbiz, 39, 1970. 224 ff. (See Hebrew Section).
- UNTERMAN, A. "Shechinah" (Bible, Targums, Talmud and Midrash), Encyclopaedia Judaica, Keter, v.14, pp. 1349-52.
- VERMES, G. Haggada in Onkelos' Targum, J.S.S. 7. 1963, pp. 159-169.
- The Targumic Versions of Genesis 4, 3-16. Annual Leeds University Society 3, 1961-62, pp. 81-118.

- VERMES, G.           The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on  
Jewish Studies during the last Twenty  
Five Years. J.J.S. vol. 26, Nos. 1-2,  
Spring/Autumn, 1975.
- \_\_\_\_.               Scripture and Tradition in Judaism,  
Leiden, 1961.
- VERMES, P.           Buber's Understanding of the Divine Name,  
related to Bible, Targum and Midrash.  
J.J.S. vol. 24, No. 2. Autumn 1973, pp. 147-166.
- WALKER, T.           The Hastings Dictionary of the Bible,  
Art. Targum IV, Edinburgh, 1902.
- WAXMAN, M.           Bible: Halacha and Aggadah, Encyclopaedia  
Judaica, Keter, 1972, v. II, pp. 314-322.
- WEINBERG, J.J.       On the History of the Targumim, Abraham  
Weiss Jubilee Volume, New York, 1964,  
p. 364 ff. (See Hebrew Section).
- WIEDER, N.           The Habakkuk Scroll and the Targum,  
J.J.S. 4, 1953, pp. 14-18.

WERBLOWSKY, R.J. Anthropomorphism, Encyclopaedia

Judaica, Keter, v.3, pp. 50-56.

WERNBERG-MÖLLER, P. Some Observations on the Relationship of

the Peshitta Version of the Book of

Genesis to the Palestinian Targum

Fragments, St. Th. 15, 1961, pp. 128-180.

— Prolegomena to a Re-examination of the

Palestinian Targum Fragments of the Book

of Genesis, J.S.S. 7, 1962, pp. 253-266.

ZUNZ, L.

Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden

Historisch Entwickelt 1892. (See Hebrew

Section).

Earlier Rabbinic Sourcesתרגומים

תרגום אונקלוס, מקראות גדולות, פרדס, ניו-יורק, חשי"א.

תרגום אונקלוס, מהדורת א. ברלינר, ברלין 1884.

כתבי הקדש בארמית, תרגום אונקלוס לתורה, כרך א'. מהדורת א. שפרבר  
ליידן 1959.

תרגום יונתן ותרגום ירושלמי (או תרגום הקסעים) על חמישה חומשי

תורה - רב פנינים, הוצאת לוי אפשטיין, וורשה תרע"ג.

תרגום ניאופיטי, ב' כרכים, כתב יד ותיקן, הוצאת מקור ירושלים תשל"א.

תרגום יונתן (על הנביאים) מקראות גדולות, פרדס, ניו-יורק חשי"א.

"כתבי הקדש בארמית" - תרגום יונתן לנביאים ראשונים כרך ב' מהדורת  
שפרבר ליידן 1959.

תרגום יונתן לנביאים אחרונים, ליידן 1962.

תרגום כתובים מקראות גדולות, פרדס ניו-יורק חשי"א.

כתבי הקדש בארמית, תרגום לכתובים כרך ד', ליידן 1968.



Earlier Rabbinic Sourcesמדרשים

- מדרש רבה (עם כל המפרשים), הוצאת מדרש ניו-יורק חסי"ב, ב' כרכים.  
 מדרש אגדה, שלמה באבער, הוצאת מדע ניו-יורק חס"ך, ב' כרכים.  
 אגרת בראשית, מהדורת ש. באבער, קראקא תרס"ג.  
 מדרש הגדול, בראשית שמות, מהדורת מרדכי מרגליות, הוצאת מוסד הרב קוק, ירושלים תשכ"ז.  
 מדרש הגדול, ויקרא, מהדורת עדין שטיינזלץ, הוצאת מוסד הרב קוק, ירושלים תשל"ו.  
 מדרש הגדול, במדבר, מהדורת צבי מאיר רבינוביץ, הוצאת מוסד הרב קוק, ירושלים תשל"ג.  
 מדרש הגדול, דברים, מהדורת שלמה פיש, הוצאת מוסד הרב קוק, ירושלים תשל"ג.  
 מדרש לקח טוב - על חמישה חומשי תורה, רבינו טוביה ב"ר אליעזר, שלמה באבער, ב' כרכים, ירושלים.  
 מדרש תנחומא, מהדורת לוי אפשטיין ירושלים חשכ"ט.  
 מדרש תנחומא, מהדורת שלמה באבער, וילנא תרע"ג, ב' כרכים.  
 מדרש פסיקתא רבתי, מהדורת מאיר איש שלום, תל-אביב חשכ"ג.  
 ילקוט שמעוני, מהדורת בצלאל לנדוי ירושלים חס"ך, ב' כרכים.  
 אוצר מדרשים, יהודה ד. אייזענסטיין, הוצאת יהושע א. גראסמאן, ניו-יורק, חשט"ז, ב' כרכים.  
 מדרש שכל טוב, בראשית ושמות, מהדורת ש. באבער, ברלין תר"ס-תרס"א.  
 מדרש רבי דוד הנגיד - ספר בראשית, מהדורת אברהם יצחק כץ, הוצאת מוסד הרב קוק, ירושלים חשכ"ד.

בתי מדרשות, מדרש חז"ל על פי כתבי יד מגניזת ירושלים ובצרים.  
הערות וציונים מאת הרב טלמה אהרן ורטהימר, ב' כרכים.

מדרש סמואל, מהדורת ס. באבער, קראקא תרנ"ג.

מדרש בראשית זוטא, חיברו רבי ישמעאל ב"ר נסים מסנות עם הערות

מרדכי הכהן. מוסד הרב קוק, ירושלים תשכ"ב.

מדרש תנאים, דברים, מהדורת דוד צבי הופמן, ברלין 1909.

אוצר האגדה התלמודית והמדרשית, מהדורת משה דוד גרוס, מוסד הרב

קוק, ירושלים תשל"ד, ג' כרכים.

אוצר מדרשים, יהודה דוד אייזענשטיין, דפוס "נאבעל" אפסעס פרינסטערס,

ניו-יורק, תשט"ז (ב' כרכים).

אבות דרבי נתן - בסתי נוסחאות, מהדורת ס.ז. שעכטער, ווינא תרמ"ז.

מכילתא דרבי ישמעאל, מהדורת מאיר איש שלום, ווינא תר"ל.

מכילתא דרבי ישמעאל, מהדורת הרב מאיר לייבוש, מלבי"ם, פרדס,

ירושלים 1956.

מכילתא דרבי שמעון, מהדורת י. נ. אפשטיין - ע. צ. מלמד, ירושלים

תשט"ז.

סדר עולם השלם, להתנא רבי יוסי בן רבי חלפתא, מהדורת משה יאיר

ויינסטאק, ירושלים סיון תשט"ז.

סדר אליהו רבה - סדר אליהו זוטא - מהדורת מאיר איש שלום, ירושלים

תש"ך.

סכרא, מהדורת נ. מרגליות, הוסיאטין תרס"ח.

ספרא, מהדורת הרב מאיר ליבוש מלבי"ם, פרדס, ירושלים 1956.

ספרי, במדבר דברים, מהדורת מאיר איס טלום, וינא תרנ"ד.  
 ספרי, במדבר דברים, מהדורת הרב מ. ליכוס מלבי"ם, פרס, ירושלים  
 1957.

פסיקתא דרב כהנא, מהדורת ש. באכער, ליק תרכ"ח.  
 פרקי דרבי אליעזר, וורסה תרנ"ב.  
 פרקי דרבי אליעזר, מהדורה מדעית, הוצאת מקור ירושלים תשל"ב.  
 (כחב-יד רח"ם הורוביץ).  
 תלמוד בבלי, הוצאת מאגנס, ניו-יורק 1959.  
 תלמוד ירושלמי, הוצאת ס. רובינסטיין, ירושלים תשל"ג.  
 זוהר על התורה, מהתנא רבי שמעון בן יוחאי ז"ל, ירושלים. (צלום  
 מהזוהר הנדפס בליוורנו, סנת ויגד לכס את בריתו לפ"ק).  
 ד' כרכים.

זוהר על חמישה חומשי תורה, מהתנא רבי שמעון בן יוחאי, ווילנא  
 הוצאת האלמנה והאחים ראס, תרמ"ב. (ג' כרכים).

### Mediaeval Jewish Commentators

רש"י על התורה, מהדורת א. ברלינר, פראנקפורט תרס"ה.  
 רב סעדיה גאון על התורה, מהדורת הרב יוסף קאפח, מוסד הרב קוק,  
 ירושלים תשכ"ג.

מפרוסי הגאונים רב סעדיה ורשב"ן חפני במדרש הגדול - משה צוקר,  
 בספר יובל לאברהם וויס, ניו-יורק תשכ"ד - תש"א-תפ"א.  
 רש"י, רבינו אברהם אבן עזרא, רמב"ן, ספורנו - מקראות גדולות,  
 פרס, ניו-יורק תשי"א.

רבי אברהם אבן עזרא על ספר יסעיהו, מהדורת מ. פרידלנד לונדון  
1873.

רמב"ן - בראשית סמות, מהדורת הרב חיים דב שעוועל, מוסד הרב קוק  
ירושלים תשי"ט.

\_\_\_\_ - ויקרא, במדבר, דברים, מהדורת הרב חיים דב שעוועל, מוסד  
הרב קוק, ירושלים תש"ך.

רמב"ם - מורה הנבוכים, מהדורת הרב יוסף קאפח, מוסד הרב קוק תשל"ב.  
רבינו אברהם בן הרמב"ם, על בראשית וסמות, מהדורת הר' אפרים יהודה  
בן כה"ר שרגא וויזנברג, הוצאת ששון, לונדון תשי"ח.  
רבי יהודה הלוי, כוזרי, הוצאת ירושלים.

רשב"ם - פירוש התורה, מהדורת דוד ראזין ברעסלויא תרמ"ב.  
\_\_\_\_ חמישה חומשי תורה, רב פנינים, הוצאת לוי אפשטיין, וורשה  
תרע"ג.

רד"ק - על התורה, מהדורת הרב משה קמלהר, הוצאת מוסד הרב קוק,  
ירושלים תשל"ל.

\_\_\_\_ פרוש השלם על חהילים, מהדורת אברהם דרום, הוצאת מוסד הרב  
קוק, ירושלים תשכ"ז.

\_\_\_\_ על נביאים - הוצאת פרדס, ניו-יורק תשי"א.

\_\_\_\_ ספר הסרסים - עם הנימוקים מרבי אליהו הלוי האשכנזי ברלין  
1847.

בעלי החוספות, מושב זקנים על התורה, מהדורת סלימאן דוד ששון,  
לונדון תשי"ט.

\_\_\_\_ - על התורה מהדורת שרגא אברמסון, הוצאת מוסד הרב  
קוק, ירושלים תשל"ה.

רבינו בחיי - בראשית, מהדורת הרב חיים דב שעוועל, הוצאת מוסד  
הרב קוק, ירושלים תשכ"ז.

רבינו בחיי - שמות ויקרא, מהדורת הרב חיים דב שעוועל, הוצאת  
מוסד הרב קוק, ירושלים תשכ"ז.

---- - במדבר דברים, מהדורת הרב חיים דב שעוועל, הוצאת  
מוסד הרב קוק, ירושלים תשל"ד.

רבי יוסף קרא לנביאים ראשונים, מהדורת שמעון עפשטיין, מוסד הרב  
קוק, ירושלים תשל"ג.

רבי יוסף בכר שור - פירוש לחמישה חומטי תורה, הוצאת מקור, ירושלים  
תשל"ח, ג' כרכים.

רבי יונה בן ג'נאח (בלטון ערב), וחרגמו רבי יהודה בן תבון -  
הוספות ותקונים מאת בנימין זאב באבער, ברלין, חרנ"ו.  
(נדפס גם כן בירושלים תשכ"ו).

מנחם בן סרוק - עם חסובות דונש בן לברט, והכרעות רבינו יעקב חס,  
מהדורת ר.צ. פיליפאווסקי, לונדון ועדינבורג 1854.

רבי מיוחס ב"ר אליהו, פירוש על ספר במדבר עם הערות הרב שלמה פרייליך  
הוצאת מוסד הרב קוק, ירושלים תשל"ו.

רבי מיוחס ב"ר אליהו, פירוש על ספר דברים עם הערות הרב יחיאל  
מיכל כץ, הוצאת מוסד הרב קוק, ירושלים תשכ"ח.

דון יצחק אברבנאל - על התורה, ג' כרכים, הוצאת בני ארבל,  
ירושלים תשכ"ד.

רבי אליהו מזרחי - מקראות גדולות, דפוס אשכול, ירושלים תשל"ו.

Mediaeval Jewish Commentatorsפסקי הלכות

- רמב"ם - יד החזקה, (מסנה תורה), הוצאת פרדס, ירוסלים תשי"ט.
- \_\_\_ - פירוש המסניות, מהדורת הרב יוסף קאפח, הוצאת מוסד הרב קוק, ירוסלים תשכ"ה - תשכ"ז.
- רמב"ן - כתבי רמב"ן, תורת האדם, מהדורת הרב חיים דב שעוועל, הוצאת מוסד הרב קוק, ירוסלים, ב' כרכים תשכ"ג - תשכ"ד.
- רבי יעקב - בעל הטורים, הוצאת מאורות, ירוסלים תשכ"ט.
- רבי יוסף קארו - השלחן ערוך, הוצאת פאר התורה, תשכ"א.

Modern Studies (Hebrew)

- אדלר נתן - נתינה לגר, ביאור על תרגום אונקלוס, ספר תורת אלקים, חומש ווילנא תרל"ד.
- אלכובן יצחק משה - "התפילה בישראל בהתפתחותה ההיסטורית", (במיוחד ראה מאמרו "תרגום הקריאה", עמוד 40), הוצאת דביר, תל-אביב תשל"ב.
- אבינרי יצחק - "היכל רט"י", תל-אביב, ד' כרכים, (כרך ג' 1956, כרך ד' 1960) מלון רט"י 1949.
- אלבק ח. - מבוא ומפתחות למדרש בראשית רבה, ירושלים תשכ"ה.
- - מבוא למשנה.
- - הלכה חיצונה בתרגומי א"י ובאגדה - ספר היובל לבנימין מ. לוין, ירושלים ת"ש, עמ' צ"ג-ק"ד.
- - ששה סדרי משנה, מוסד ביאליק, ירושלים - דביר, תל-אביב, תשל"ו, תשל"ז, תשל"ח.
- אסף ש. - "הקראים" - תקופת הגאונים וספרותה, מוסד הרב קוק, תשכ"ז קי"ז - קכ"ד.
- אורבך א. א. - חז"ל - פרקי אמונות ודעות, האוניברסיטה העברית ירושלים, תשכ"ט.
- בכר ב. ז. - ערכי מדרש (תרגום מגרמנית - א. ז. רבינוביץ), תל-אביב תרפ"ג.
- בלקין סמואל - מקור קדום למדרשי חז"ל - מדרש שו"ת על בראשית וסמות לפילון האלכסנדרוני, (בספר היובל לאברהם וויס, דפוס סלוינגר, ניו-יורק תשכ"ד), חקע"ט-תרל"ב.

ברלין יסעיה - כיני תרגומא ברעסלווא, בשנת ויקראו בספר בתורת

הא' מפורט - ושום שכל ויבינו במקרא.

בער יצחק - היסודות ההסטוריים של ההלכה, ציון שנה י"ז, חשי"ב.

בערקוביץ בן ציון יהודה - חליפות סמלות, ווילנא תרל"ד.

----- עוסה אור, ווילנא תר"ג (נדפס ישראל תשכ"ט).

----- לחם וסמלה, ווילנא תר"י - תרס"ן.

בן אמוזג אליהו - גר צדק, ליוורנו 1850.

ברייאר מ. - מדרסים וביאורים עלומי מקור בתרגום הארמי לתורה

המיוחס ליונתן בן עוזיאל, ספר היובל לאברהם וויס,

ניו-יורק תשכ"ד, עמ' ר"א - רל"א.

גייגר אברהם - המקרא ותרגומיו, הוצאת מוסד ביאליק, ירושלים תש"ס.

גינצבורג לוי - על הלכה ואגדה, חל אביב תש"ך.

גסן משה - קטעים נבחרים מתרגומי המקרא, ירושלים חשי"ח.

גולב נחום - תולדות היהודים בעיר רואן בימי הביניים. ראה פרק ח',

שהותו של הראב"ע בעיר רדום, הוצאת דביר, חל אביב

1976.

דודי ע. - המערכת המורפולוגית של הפועל בתרגום אונקלוס, האוניברסיטה

בר-אילן תש"ל.

הופמן ד. צ. - ויקרא ב' כרכים, הוצאת מוסד הרב קוק, ירושלים

תשכ"ו - תשכ"ח.

היינמן יוסף - מסורות פרטניות קדומות באגדה ובתרגום, תרביץ ל"ה

תשכ"ו, עמ' 84-94.

----- תרגום שמות כ"ד ד' וההלכה הקדומה, תרביץ ל"ח

תשכ"ט, עמ' 294-296. (הסוה מאמרו באנגלית).

הסיל אברהם - עיונים במדרש, בספר היובל לאברהם וויס, ניו-יורק

תשכ"ד, שמ"ט-ש"ס.

הירשברג ח. ז. - על מקומם של תרגומים ארמיים בחיי עמינו, (ספר

הכנה). בר אילן א'. (לזכרו של פ. חורגין), תשכ"ג

עמ' 16-23.



- הרסקוביץ מ. - למי נועד תרגום אונקלוס, הדרום, חוברת ל"ב, ניו-יורק חש"ר תשל"א. עמ' 155-170.
- - אונקלוס ובית מדרשו של רבי עקיבא, אור המזרח, ניו-יורק 1969, חוברת 3, עמ' 157. - (v.18)
- ויינברג יחיאל יעקב - חולדות התרגומים, בספרו שרידי אש חלק ד', מוסד הרב קוק, ירושלים תשכ"ט. רס"ז - רע"ה.
- (הסוה מאמרו בספר היובל לאברהם וויס, ניו-יורק תשכ"ד, שס"א-טע"ו).
- - הדרש ההלכי והפרטנות המקראית, שם שרידי אש - ל"ט-מ"ז.
- - פירוש הכתוב מיטב טדהו לפי התרגומים הקדמונים - שם, שרידי אש מ"ח-נ"ד.
- ורטהיימר ש. א. - אור התרגום ירושלים תרצ"ה.  
 וולפסון צבי א. - פילון האלכסנדרוני - יסודות הפילוסופיה הדתית היהודית, מוסד הרב קוק, ב' כרכים תש"ל.  
 וויס אברהם - לחקר התלמוד, חלק א', ניו יורק 1954.
- - מחקרים במשפט התלמוד, ניו-יורק 1957.
- וויס אייזיק הירש - דור דור ודורטיו, הוצאת פלאט ומינקוס, ניו-יורק / ברלין תרפ"ד.
- חורגין פנחס - תרגום כתובים, ניו-יורק תש"ה.
- - ההלכה בתרגום אונקלוס, חורב ט. חש"ו, עמ' 79-93.
- חיות צ. ח. - אגרת בקרת, מהדורת יעקב ברילל פרעסבורג תרי"ג.  
 (הסוה מאיר הרסקוביץ, רבי צבי הירש חיות, מוסד הרב קוק, ירושלים תשל"ב פרק 15 ת"ז-תי"א).
- טווינג א. - הנוסח והדין בראי העדויות הקדומות, 1969-1970, חרביץ 39. 224. (A.Toeg)
- טור סיני נ. ה. - להבנת התרגום הארמי לתורה, ספר מאגנס, ירושלים תרח"ץ, עמ' 143-151.

- טור סיני נ. ה. - "השפעת הארמית על העברית", אנציקלופדיה מקראית, כרך א', תשכ"ה עמ' 593.
- כסר אסא ודוד רידר - האם ראה רש"י את תרגום יונתן בן עוזיאל? סיני, כרך נ"ח, חוברת א-ב (סמ"ט - ש"נ), חטרי חסון תשכ"ו. מוסד הרב קוק ירושלים. דף ז-צ"ד.
- לעווענשטיין מרדכי, - נפש הגר על תרגום אונקלוס, בראשית פיעטרקוב תרס"ו. טכות פיעטרקוב תרס"ח. ויקרא במדבר, בילגורייא עת"ר. דברים, פיעטרקוב תער"ב. נדפס מחדש, הוצאת מקור, ירושלים תשל"ב.
- לוצאטו ש. ד. (סד"ל) - אוהב גר, קראקא, שנת (בזמירות נריע לו) 1895.
- פירוש על חמישה חומסי תורה, הוצאת דביר, תל אביב, תשל"ב. (הדפסה ראשונה בפאדובה, תרל"א).
- ליפטיץ אליעזר מאיר, - "רש"י", מוסד הרב קוק ירושלים 1966. מלבי"ם מאיר ליבוש - אוצר הפרושים על תנ"ך מקראות גדולות, סדרא א', פרדס, ירושלים חשי"ז.
- מלמד עזרא ציון - "לתרגום מגילת רות", ספר הסנה בר-אילן א. הוצאת קרית ספר, 1963 עמ' 194 - 190.
- מפרסי המקרא, הוצאת מגנס, האוניברסיטה העברית, ב' כרכים ירושלים, תשל"ה.
- מרגליות אליעזר - "היחס שבין פירוש הרשב"ם לפירוש הראב"ע על התורה", (בספר אסף לכבוד פרופ' שמחה אסף), מוסד הרב קוק, ירושלים חשי"ג, עמ' 357-369.

- סגל מ. צ. - מבוא המקרא א-ד, ירושלים חש"ך.
- עזריה כן האדומים - מאור עיניים, פרק נ"ז, ווילנא תרכ"ו.
- פדרבוש ש. - רס"י - תורתו ואיסיותו, בעריכת ד"ר ש. פדרבוש, ניו-יורק חשי"ח.
- פתסגן - על תרגום אונקלוס, נספח בספר תורת אלוקים, (עם פירוש נתינה לגר), ווילנא תרל"ד. (טד"ל מכנהו ספר יא"ר).
- פאעור יוסף - "המסורה של תרגום אונקלוס", חוברת, סיני ס', תשכ"ז עמ' י"ז-כ"ז.
- פוזננסקי ש. א. - מבוא על חכמי צרפת מפרסי המקרא, ירושלים תשכ"ה.
- צונץ י. ליפמאן - הדרשות בישראל והשתלטותן ההיסטורית, הוצאת ביאליק, ירושלים חשל"ד.
- קאסוטו מ. ד. - על חנ"ך (מפורט על ידי א. ש. הרטום), הוצאת יבנה, תל אביב חשל"ח.
- פירוש על ספר בראשית. (סדר בראשית, סדר נח, וחלק מסדר לך לך). הוצאת מגנס, האוניברסיטה העברית ירושלים חשל"ח.
- פירוש על ספר שמות, הוצאת מאגנס, האוניברסיטה העברית ירושלים, חשל"ה.
- ספרות מקראית וספרות כנענית, הוצאת האוניברסיטה העברית ירושלים חשל"ט.
- קדרי מ. צ. - "מחקר תרגום אונקלוס בימינו", מעמד המחקר. ספר זכרון י. ליוור, המקרא ותולדות ישראל 1972, עמ' 341-374.
- קדרי מ. צ. - מגילת אנטיוכס הארמית, אוניברסיטה בר-אילן, ספר הסנה למדעי היהדות, אזכרה לפרופ' מ. חורגין, ירושלים חשכ"ג, דף: 81-105.

קויפמן י. - תולדות האמונה הישראלית - הוצאת מוסד ביאליק  
 ירושלים - דביר, תל אביב תשל"ו, (ד' כרכים).  
 ריפמן יעקב - דרכי המתרגמים (על תרגום יהונתן), פטרבורג -  
 תרנ"ב.

קוטשר י. - "ארמית", אנציקלופדיה מקראית כרך א'. תשט"ו,  
 עמ' 584-593.

קומלוש יהודה - "המקרא באור התרגום", הוצאת דביר, תל אביב  
 תשל"ג.

-----  
 "קויט אופיינייט בתרגום אונקלוס", תדפיס מתוך  
 סנתון בר אילן, כרך ו' תשכ"ח. עמ' 181-190.

-----  
 - האגדה בתרגומי ברכת יעקב, ספר השנה בר-אילן א'  
 הוצאת קרית ספר, 1963, עמ' 195-206.

רפ פורט שלמה יהודה, (טי"ר) - כרם חמד, מחברת ו' פראג, תר"א  
 עמ' 204-227.

-----  
 - דברי שלום ואמת, פראג 1861.

שפטל שמסון ברוך - באורי אונקלוס, מינכן תרמ"ח.

שטיגר סמואל - אבני שיס, (על תרגום יהונתן), מתקטש תרפ"ח.

שמרלר בנימין - אהבת יהונתן (על תרגום יהונתן), בילגוריו

תרצ"ג.